

BL

2775

.E6

Copy 2

FT MEADE  
GenColl



Class BL 2725

Book .E 6

Copy 2







# **FIVE PEBBLES**

FROM

**THE BROOK.**

BEING

## **A REPLY**

TO

**“A DEFENCE OF CHRISTIANITY”**

WRITTEN BY

**EDWARD EVERETT,**

GREEK PROFESSOR OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

IN ANSWER TO

**“THE GROUNDS OF CHRISTIANITY EXAMINED**

BY

**COMPARING THE NEW TESTAMENT WITH THE OLD.”**

BY

**GEORGE BETHUNE ENGLISH.**



“Should a wise man utter vain knowledge, and fill his belly with the east wind?”

“Should he reason with unprofitable talk? or with speeches wherewith he can do no good?—Thou chooseth the tongue of the crafty. Thy own mouth condemneth thee, and not I; yea, thine own lips testify against thee.”

“Behold I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument having teeth.

BIBLE.

---

**PHILADELPHIA:**

**PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.**

**1824.**

BL 2775  
E 6 2  
COPY

4546  
6270

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

WHEN I left America, I had no intention of giving Mr. Everett's book a formal answer: but having learned since my arrival in the Old World, that the controversy in which I had engaged myself had attracted some attention, and had been reviewed by a distinguished member of a German university, my hopes of being serviceable to the cause of truth and philanthropy are revived, and I have therefore determined to give a Reply to Mr. Everett's publication.

In this Work, as in my prior writings, I have taken for granted the Divine Authority of the Old Testament, and I have argued upon the principle that every book, claiming to be considered as a Divine Revelation and building itself upon the Old Testament as upon a foundation, must agree with it, otherwise the superstructure cannot stand. The New Testament, the Talmud, and the Koran are all placed by their authors upon the Law and the Prophets, as an edifice is upon its foundation; and if it be true that any or all of them be found to be irreconcilable with the primitive Revelation

to which they all refer themselves, the question as to their Divine Authority is decided against them, most obviously and completely.

This work was written in Egypt and forwarded to the U. States, while I was preparing to accompany Ismael Pacha to the conquest of Ethiopia; an expedition in which I expected to perish, and therefore felt it to be my duty to leave behind me, something from which my countrymen might learn what were my real sentiments upon a most important and interesting subject; and as I hoped would learn too, how grossly they had been deluded into building their faith and hope upon a demonstrated error.

On my arrival from Egypt I found that the MS. had not been published, and I was advised by several of my friends to abandon the struggle and to imitate their example, in submitting to the despotism of popular opinion, which, they said, it was imprudent to oppose. I was so far influenced by these representations—extraordinary indeed in a country which boasts that here freedom of opinion and of speech is established by law—that I intended to confine myself to sending the MS. to Mr. Everett; in the belief that when he should have the weakness of his arguments in behalf of what he defended and the injustice of his aspersions upon me, fairly and evidently laid before him, that he would make me at least a private apology. He chose to preserve a sullen silence, probably believing that he is so securely seated in the saddle which his bre-



thren have girthed upon the back of "a strong ass," that there is no danger that the animal will give him a fall.

Not a little moved at this, I determined to do my myself justice, and to publish the pages following.

This book is not the work of an Infidel. I am not an infidel; what I have learned and seen in Europe, Asia and Africa, while it has confirmed my reasons for rejecting the New Testament, has rooted in my mind the conviction that the ancient Bible does contain a Revelation from the God of Nature, as firmly as my belief in the first proposition of Euclid.

The whole analogy of Nature, while it is in many respects opposed to the characteristics ascribed to the Divinity by the metaphysicians, yet bears witness in my opinion, that this world was made and is governed by just such a Being as the Jehovah of the Old Testament; while the palpable fulfilment of predictions contained in that book, and which is so strikingly manifest in the Old World, leaves in my mind no doubt whatever, of the ultimate fulfilment of all that it promises, and all that it threatens.

I cannot do better than to conclude these observations with the manly declaration of the celebrated Christian orator Dr. Chalmers. "We are ready, (says he,) to admit that as the object of the inquiry is not the *character*, but the *Truth* of Christianity, the philosopher should be careful to protect his mind from the delusions of its charms. He should separate the exercises of the understanding from the

tendencies of the fancy or of the heart. He should be prepared to follow the light of evidence, though it should lead him to conclusions the most painful and melancholy. He should train his mind to all the hardihood of abstract and unfeeling intelligence. He should give up every thing to *the supremacy of argument*, and be able to renounce without a sigh all the tenderest possessions of infancy, the moment that TRUTH demands of him the sacrifice.” (*Dr. Chalmers on the Evidence and Authority of the Christian Religion. Ch. 1.*)

Finally, let the Reader remember, that “there is one thing in the world more contemptible than the slave of a tyrant—it is the *dupe* of a SOPHIST.”

G. B. E.

## PEBBLE I.

---

And David "chose him five smooth stones out of the brook, and put them in a shepherd's bag which he had, even in a scrip: and his sling was in his hand: and he drew near to the Philistine."

Mr. Everett commences his work with the following remarks. "Was Jesus Christ the person foretold by the prophets, as the Messiah of the Jews?; one method, and a very obvious one, of examining his claims to this character, is to compare his person, life, actions, and doctrine, with the supposed predictions of them. But if it also appear that this Jesus wrought such works, as evinced that he enjoyed the supernatural assistance and co-operation of God, this certainly is a fact of great importance. For we cannot say, that in estimating the validity of our Lord's claims to the character of Messiah, it is of no consequence whether, while he advanced those claims, he wrought such works as proved his intimacy with the God of truth. While he professed himself the Messiah, is it indifferent whether he was showing himself to be a being beyond delusion, and above imposture?—Let us make the case our own. Suppose that we were witnesses of the miraculous works of a personage of pretensions like our Lord's, should we think it necessary or reasonable to resort to long courses of argument, or indeed to any process of the under-



standing, except what was requisite to establish the fact of the miracles? Should we, while he was opening the eyes of the blind, and raising the dead from their graves, feel it necessary to be deciphering prophecies, and weighing these difficulties? Now we may transfer this case to that of Christianity. The miracles of our Lord are either true or false. The infidel if he maintain the latter *must prove it*; and if the former can be made to appear, they are beyond all comparison the most direct and convincing testimony that can be devised," p. 1, 2. of Mr. Everett's work.

To this statement I would reply—that I do not know what right Mr. Everett has to call upon his opponent, to prove a negative. It was his business to prove the affirmative of his question, and to show that these miracles actually were performed, before he proceeded to argue upon the strength of them. It is, I conceive, impossible to demonstrate that miracles said to have been wrought 1800 years ago, were *not* performed; but it is, I believe, quite possible to show that there is no sufficient proof that they were. One of the reasons given, in the 2d, ch. as I think, of the grounds of Christianity examined, for throwing out of consideration the miracles recorded in the New Testament in examining the question of the Messiahship of Jesus, was, that the New Testament itself, was not a sufficient proof that these miracles were actually wrought; and this, with the reader's indulgence, I think I can plainly show.

Mr. Everett allows p. 450 of his work, what indeed he cannot deny, that the four Gospels do sometimes contradict each other in their narratives; and he refers with approbation, in a note to p. 458, to a work of Lessing's, which he says, "ought to be read by every one who is overfond of Harmonies." This work of Lessing's, if I recollect right, maintains, that all hopes of harmonizing the



evangelists, of reconciling their contradictions, must be given up. [See Lessings *Sämmtliche, Schriften*, ch. v. §. 150, as quoted by Mr. Everett, p. 458.]

Now these contradictions, if they do exist, unquestionably argue one of two things; either fraud, or want of accurate information in their authors, as no man who wishes to be considered *compos mentis*, will deny; because, *accurate* information excludes the possibility of contradiction in authors willing to tell the truth, and much more in inspired authors, who must be incapable of writing any thing but the truth.

The Christian, therefore, must, it seems to me, on account of these contradictions, allow one of two things; either, that the evangelists were fraudulent men, or else that the Gospels were not written by the Apostles and immediate followers of Jesus: because want of accurate information, cannot be supposed of the Apostles and immediate followers of Jesus; as having been constantly with him, from the beginning, to the end of his ministry, they must have been perfectly acquainted with his actions and doctrines. Neither can lapse of memory be urged; because the Gospels represent Jesus as saying, John ch. xvi. 26, that they should have the aid of inspiration, which "should bring all things to remembrance;" and in Acts ch. iv. 31, all the followers of Jesus are represented as having actually received the effusion of the Holy Ghost: of course want of accurate information, and lapse of memory in them cannot be supposed.

The Christian, therefore, must allow, since contradictions do exist, if he would avoid accusing the Apostles and disciples of Jesus of fraud, that the Gospels were not written by the Apostles and first followers of Jesus, but that they were written by men, who had no accurate information about the events they record. It is therefore plain, that the

miracles recorded in the Gospels, are incapable of proof. For what Christian in his senses can ask another man to believe accounts of *miracles*, which accounts, he must at the same time allow, were written by fraudulent men, or by men who had no accurate information upon the subjects about which they write.!!

The edge of this, as I think, smites right through the neck of Mr. Everett's argument on which his work depends, and leaves his book— "a gasping head—a quivering trunk." *Sic transit gloria mundi.*

But in order to make Mr. Everett still farther sensible how easily his argument can be "overturned, overturned and overturned," I will suppose a reasonable and reasoning man, desirous to verify the claims of the books of the New Testament as containing a Revelation from God, to set down to scrutinize with anxious solicitude every argument of internal and external evidence in favour of their authenticity, and authority, in the hope of becoming satisfied of the truth of their claims. But in the course of his examination, such a man will assuredly find, that almost every step in his inquiry, is an occasion of doubt and of difficulty.

Books containing Revelations from the Supreme, must be consistent with themselves. But he will observe on a careful perusal of the evangelists, that the contradictions, particularly in the narratives of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, are numerous; and that all the ingenuity of Christian writers, has been exhausted in vain in the attempt to reconcile them; for example, the Gospel called of Matthew says, ch. iii. 14, that John the Baptist, *knew* Jesus when he came to him to be baptised, (which was very probable on account of the relationship and intimacy subsisting between Mary the mother of Jesus, and Elizabeth the mother of John, as mentioned in the Gospel called of Luke, ch. i. 18, it could hardly have been otherwise) but

the author of the Gospel called of John says, ch. i. 31, that John knew him *not*, until he was designated by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon him.

Again, it is said in the Gospel called of John, ch. ii. 14. that Jesus, on his *first* visit to Jerusalem after he had commenced his preaching, cast the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, whereas the Gospel called of Matthew, and also those called of Mark and Luke, represent this to have been done by Jesus at his *last* visit to Jerusalem. See Matt. ch. xxi. 12. Mark ch. xi. 15. Luke ch. xix. 45.

Again, the author of the Gospel called of John, represents the last supper of Jesus with his Apostles, to have taken place (See ch. xiii. 1. and ch. xviii. 28.) on the *eve before* the feast of the passover, and that Jesus was crucified *on the feast day itself*; while the authors of the other Gospels represent the first event to have taken place, on the evening of the passover *itself*, and that Jesus was crucified *the day after*. See Matt. ch. xxvi. 18. Mark xiv. 12. Luke ch. xxii. 7. Now Matthew and John must, according to the Gospels themselves, have been present with Jesus when he drove the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, and at his last supper, and when he was seized in the garden of Gethsemane; they must therefore have known perfectly whether Jesus drove the buyers and sellers out of the Temple, at his *first* visit to Jerusalem in their company; or at his *last*, and whether his last supper, and his seizure in the garden of Gethsamane took place on the *eve before* the passover their great national festival, or on *the evening of the passover itself*. They could not forget the time and place of events, so affecting and important as the last mentioned, and when we add to these considerations, that the Gospels represent Jesus as saying, (John ch. xiv. 26.) that they should be inspired by the Holy Spirit,



which "should bring all things to remembrance," the supposition that the real Matthew and John could contradict each other in this manner, becomes quite inadmissible.

In the accounts of the resurrection of Jesus, the most important fact of Christianity, we also find several contradictions; for instance, the Gospel called of Matthew says, that the first appearance of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection, was in Galilee, (See Matt. ch. xxviii. 7.) while the other evangelists assert, that his first appearance to them after that event was at Jerusalem. See Mark ch. xvi. Luke ch. xxiv. John ch. xx. The Gospel called of John says, that he afterwards appeared to them in Galilee: but according to that of Luke, the disciples did *not go* to Galilee to meet Jesus; for that Gospel says, that Jesus expressly ordered his disciples to tarry at Jerusalem, where they should receive the effusion of the Holy Ghost, and that after giving that order he was taken up to Heaven. See Luke ch. xxiv. 49, 50, also, the first ch. of Acts.\*

\* Mr. Everett appears willing to allow, as said before, the existence of these contradictions in the narratives of the Evangelists, particularly in their accounts of the resurrection of Jesus, [See p. 456. of his work.] but maintains their credibility nevertheless, and in justification of this opinion, he quotes p. 457, the contradictions of the historians of the execution of the Marquis of Argyle; a fact nevertheless not doubted. But the cases are by no means parallel; that a rebel should be decapitated is a fact of notorious frequency in British history and very probable in itself, and as it is a fact without consequence, no man will be inclined to doubt it, if it be affirmed by history, notwithstanding some contradictions in the accounts of the circumstances of his execution.

But I would ask Mr. Everett—if the same historians who report the execution of the Marquis of Argyle, had also affirmed that three days after he had his head cut off, he appeared again alive to his *particular friends* with his head on, talking and dining with them; and that one of these historians represent this to have taken place at London—another at Edinburgh—and a third at Stirling, would Mr. Everett, or any man in his senses, hesitate to consider these

This greatly invalidates the credibility of these accounts ; for as much as that the historical testimony in attestation of supernatural events, ought, because such events are out of the common course of nature, to be strong and unexceptionable.

He will observe too that these writers, supposed to have been the inspired followers of Jesus Christ, have applied many passages of the Old Testament as prophecies of Jesus, when it is most certain (and is at the present day allowed by Christian Biblical

contradictions in the accounts of such a supernatural event as of *no weight* ? Let us add to this another consideration.—Suppose that the Marquis of Argyle was a man of irreproachable and admirable character, and enthusiastically beloved by his friends, and that these friends believed in certain ancient prophecies which predicted that a Scotchman should arise, who should make Scotland supreme over all the earth, and live himself for ever : and that these friends believed the Marquis of Argyle to be the man : but that disappointed in their expectations by seeing him suffer his head to be cut off, they had their hopes revived by the appearance of this story of his having been seen alive by *twelve of his most intimate friends*, who were *the heads of the party* who had believed that the Marquis of Argyle would fulfill the prophecies aforesaid, and not content with receiving this contradictory story with avidity themselves, (which after all might have been invented as *a salvo* for his non-fulfilment or *postponing* the fulfilment of these prophecies, by submitting to be decapitated) insisted that every body else should believe it too, on pain of eternal damnation !—Would not Mr. Everett be inclined to suspect that these friends of the Marquis of Argyle were deluded men, and possibly non-compos-mentis ; and suppose that these friends of the Marquis of Argyle had told their party that he had been taken up to Heaven, for a time, but would return again into the World, before that generation had passed away, and would *then* fulfill the prophecies aforesaid ; and that this party, notwithstanding that the Marquis of Argyle did not come again before that generation had passed away nor for eighteen hundred years afterwards, still retained their belief in the aforesaid circumstances, and still insisted that *every body else* should believe them too on pain of eternal damnation ; would not Mr. Everett consider these men as certainly distracted ? “*Mutata nomine de te fabula narratur*,” Mr. Everett.

Critics of the highest standing) from examining those passages in their context in the Old Testament, that they are not prophecies of Jesus ; and that some of the passages cited are in fact no prophecies at all, but are merely historical. Nor is this all, these authors have cited as prophecies and proof texts, passages which do *not exist* in the Old Testament. From which it seems to follow that they must have forged those passages, or quoted them from some Apocryphal book which they believed to be inspired. If they were capable of the first, they were not the honest and inspired followers and disciples of Jesus Christ ; if they were capable of the last, they were not Jews but Gentiles, ignorant that the Jews in the time of Jesus, acknowledged no books as inspired scripture but the books of the Old Testament. *See Appendix, A.*

A reasonable and reasoning man, such as I have supposed, may ask himself if it be possible that men filled with the Holy Ghost, and whose minds were supernaturally opened to understand the scriptures, could make mistakes such as these.

Lastly, he will recollect, on discovering what is about to be stated, that the Apostles and followers of Jesus Christ were Jews, and consequently could not be ignorant of what was notorious to the whole nation, for instance, that the Jewish Sabbath begins at sunset on Friday evening, and ends at sunset on Saturday evening. Nevertheless the author of the Gospel called of Matthew makes ch. xxviii. 1. the Sabbath to *end* at dawn of day on Sunday morning : while the author of that called of John apparently reckons, ch. xx. 19. the evening of the first day of the week as a part of the first day of the week ; whereas it is in fact, according to the law and customs of the Jews, who then and now reckon their days from sunset to sunset, the *beginning* and a *part* of the second day of the



week. Such mistakes appear to me to indicate that the writers of those Gospels were Gentiles not perfectly acquainted with Jewish customs, and therefore not Matthew and John.\*

There are other traces of ignorance of Jewish customs, to be found in the Gospel called of Matthew, which betray the Gentilism of the author of it. For instance, he says ch. xxvi. 24, that Jesus told Peter, that "before the cock crew he should deny him thrice;" the same is also found in Mark ch. xiv. 30. in Luke ch. xxii. 54, and in John ch. xiii. 38. Now it is asserted in the Mishna (i. e. the oral law of the Jews.) in the Bava Kama according to Mr. Everett p. 448. of his work, that cocks were not permitted in Jerusalem where Peter's denial took place; [probably because that bird is constantly scratching up the ground with his feet, and was thereby liable to turn up impurities, by touching which in passing by, a Jew would be ceremonially defiled, and rendered incapable of visiting the Temple to perform his devotions, till after the evening of the day on which the defilement took place,] therefore all the four Gospels which all contain this story, must have been written by Gentiles *ignorant of the custom* which belies the story.

Some Christian writers have endeavoured to get rid of this objection, by attempting to prove that the crowing of the cock here mentioned, does not mean actually the crowing of a cock, but "the sound of a trumpet!" while others, blushing at the hardihood of their brethren, think it more prudent to maintain, that the author of the Mishna was ignor-

\* Dr. Campbell in his notes to his translation of the Evangelists in loco. tries to prove that the Greek words in the Gospel of Matthew, which undoubtedly strictly and literally signify "in the evening of the Sabbath," or "at the end of the Sabbath," may mean "the Sabbath being ended," which, if it could be established, would set aside the objection I have mentioned.

ant of Jewish customs, and that the writers of the Gospels were perfectly acquainted with them ; and that therefore every good Christian was bound in conscience not to regard the objection.

But the prohibition of cocks from entering the Holy city, is so perfectly of a piece with many other cautions against defilement observed by the Jews ; and is so perfectly in the taste of the times of the Pharisees, the careful “washers of plates and platters,”—the “tithers of mint, anise, and cummin,” not to mention the reason above expressed, which perhaps was, to say truth, according to the regulations against defilement contained in the Pentateuch a sufficient reason for excluding that bird from the city, where stood the Temple, that the reader will probably believe that such a custom might have existed.

Again, it is said Matt. xxvii. 62, that the Chief Priests and Pharisees went to Pilate ; demanded a guard ; went to the Sepulchre of Jesus ; sealed the door, and set watch. Now Jesus is said to have arisen on the day after this, on the first day of the week, i. e. Sunday, of course the day before was Saturday of the Jewish Sabbath. I maintain that the Chief Priests and Pharisees, who objected to Jesus *curing the sick* and rubbing corn from the ear, in order to satisfy his hunger on the Sabbath day ; I maintain that it is utterly incredible, that these men should have gone to Pilate on public business, and transacted all this on their Sabbath. For such an action would have come completely within the spirit, and the letter of the Laws against breaking the Sabbath contained in the Pentateuch, which makes the penalty of such actions as are here ascribed to the Chief Priests and rigorous Pharisees, nothing less than stoning to death. I infer therefore, that the author of the Gospel of



Matthew was ignorant of this, and of course not a Jew, and consequently not Matthew.

I would observe further, in connection with this subject, that Jesus is represented, Matt. xxiii. 35, as saying, that upon the Jews of this time should come "the blood of Zecharias the son of Barachias whom ye slew between the Temple and the altar." Now I believe that it is recorded in Josephus' history, that the Jews slew this Zecharias in the time of the Jewish war, about forty years after Jesus is represented as saying, that they had killed him already. Of course Jesus never could have said this, nor would a Jew acquainted with the times, as Matthew must have been, have been guilty of such an anachronism. The writer of that Gospel must therefore, have been a Gentile, and not Matthew. The same mistake is made by Luke xi. 51.

On turning his attention to the external evidence in favour of the authenticity of the Gospels, the difficulties and objections accumulate. He will find, that they are not mentioned by any writer earlier than the latter half of the second century, after the birth of Jesus. The first writers who name the four Gospels were Irenæus, and Tertullian.\* The competency of the testimony of these Fathers of the church, as to the genuineness of these books, is invalidated by the fact, (See Middleton's Free Enquiry) that they admitted the principle of the lawfulness of pious frauds, and from their having acted upon this principle, in having asserted in their writings, as from their

\* Of Irenæus and Tertullian Mr. Everett remarks, that "Tertullian was a very shrewd writer, [yes indeed, and of his fraudulent shrewdness Middleton gives some notable instances in his true inquiry] and Irenæus *less* fool than knave," p. 471. of Mr. Everett's work. I would observe to Mr. Everett, that this Irenæus is the *first* writer who

personal knowledge, things which were certainly false; (See the work above referred to) while their capability to distinguish the genuine writings of the Apostles, from the numerous forgeries in their names that appeared *about the same time* that the four Gospels begin to be mentioned, is rendered suspicious by the fact, that they also give their sanction as Divine Scriptures, to books notoriously apocryphal; for instance the book of Enoch and the Sybilline Oracles.\* The testimony of the Fathers

mentions the four Gospels, and that the Fathers of the Church who came after him in affirming the genuineness of the four Gospels *appeal to this Irenæus* this "*half fool, half knave,*" as the *authority and voucher* for their authenticity; the evidence for their authenticity *stops short* with him. Justin Martyr who flourished about the year 140 of the Christian Era, in his apology quotes, indeed, Memoirs of Jesus Christ which he says, were written by Apostles and Apostolick men. But it is, acknowledged by Bishop Marsh in his notes to Michaelis Introduction to the New Testament, that the quotations of Justin Martyr are so unlike the expressions in the received Evangelists to which they appear to refer, that one of two things must be true; either that Justin does not quote our present Gospels; or else, that they were in his time in a very different state, from what they now are.

Papias who wrote about 116 of the Christian Era says, that Matthew wrote a Gospel "in Hebrew which every one interpreted as he was able," but says nothing of a Gospel of Matthew in Greek; and that the present Greek Gospel called of Matthew could not be a translation from Matthew's Hebrew, appears from Bishops Marsh's Dissertation on the origin of these first Gospels; where he proves that it is not a translation of one work, but a compilation from several. The same is maintained by the German Theologians to be presently mentioned.

\* These Sybiline oracles so often, and so confidently appealed to by the Fathers of the Church, are now universally allowed to have been forged by the Christians themselves: of them Scaliger speaks as follows.

"Quid pseudo—Sybilina oracula quæ Christiani gentibus objiciebant, quum tamen e *Christianorum officina* prodiissent in Gentium autem Bibliothecis non reperirentur? Adeo verbum Dei inefficax esse censuerunt, ut regnum Christi sine

who succeeded them is liable to the same objections, with this aggravation that it's value diminishes more and more, as the distance of the ages in which they flourished increases, from that of Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, He will find that these Gospels were never received by the Mother Church of Jerusalem and Judea, founded by the Apostles. The Jewish Christians, the countrymen of Jesus, who one would think had the best means of knowing the real history, and real doctrines of Jesus and his Apostles, uniformly rejected not only these Gospels, but all the other books of the New Testament.\* They were also rejected, by several sects

*Mendaciis promoveri posse diffident? atque utinam illi primi mentiri cœpissent,*" apud La Roche Mem. Lit. 7. 331. as quoted by Mr. Everett, p. 228. of his work.

If the reader will consult Toland's *Amyntor*, he will find appended to that work, a list of the names of I think about a hundred Gospels, Epistles, and Revelations, forged by the Gentile Christians in the first centuries of the Christian Era. The Celebrated Semler, so distinguished for his knowledge in Biblical criticism and ecclesiastical antiquities, has said, as Mr. Everett allows, p. 464 of his work, that the general Epistles of James, Peter, and John and Jude, and the book of Revelations, contained in the New Testament at present, must be also placed upon the long list of pious frauds, fabricated in the first ages of Christianity.

\* It is an allowed principle of liberal criticism, that when the expressions of an author are capable of two senses, one of which would make him contradict himself, and the other would leave him consistent, it is but fair to suppose that he meant to be consistent, and therefore should be interpreted in the sense which would exclude self-contradiction. How has the liberal Mr. Everett acted on an occasion of this kind? I had said in my first work "the Jewish Christians, the *disciples of the twelve Apostles*, NEVER received, but rejected every individual book of the present New Testament."

I had also maintained, that the Gospels were forged after the middle of the second century. Now any reasonable man would I believe understand me as using the expressions, "Jewish Christians, the disciples of the twelve Apostles," in the same sense as when we speak of the followers of Plato,



of Christians who flourished in the early ages of Christianity.

Fourthly, He will learn too that the Christians most distinguished for their learning on this subject, for instance, Michaelis, Semler, Lessing, Eichorn, and the erudite Bishop Marsh, do allow and maintain in their works, that the Gospels according to Matthew, Mark and Luke were *compiled* from accounts of the life and doctrines of Jesus which became, *after* different *additions, revisions and translations*, the <sup>the</sup> BASIS of our present Gospels; "from such separate materials, which had gone through different hands, and had acquired a variety of text and context, from the different transcripts and translations in which they circulated, though for the most part they were copied verbatim from one another, several Gospels, among which were our three first Matthew Mark and Luke, were composed AFTER\* the destruction of Jerusalem, and designated some by the names of the readers

Whitfield, or Wesley, by the name of Disciples of Plato, Whitfield, or Wesley, without confining the expression to signify their *immediate* disciples; the insertion of the words, "never received," also suggests that this must have been my meaning. Nevertheless Mr. Everett, in order to bring me in contradiction with myself in order to serve a turn of his own, remarks upon my words, "without presuming to decide upon the opinions of a writer, so keen in detecting dissonances as Mr. English, I do presume to think, that if every individual book of the present New Testament, was rejected, by the disciples of the twelve Apostles, that they must have been in being at the time they were rejected; and therefore could not have been forged, a century after that period. I am *not* conscious of any wish to weaken the force of Mr. English's arguments, by affecting to speak of them in contemptuous terms, I would, *as I have*, answered them *fairly*, or not, at all." p. 445.

\* If so, what becomes of all Mr. Everett's laboured argument upon Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem contained in p. 401. et seq. of his work; if it be true that the prophecy was written, *after the events predicted took place!*

for whom they were designed, and others by the names of their authors and compilers." (See the life of Semler in Eichorn's Universal Library, as quoted by Mr. E. p. 465. of his work.)

These Gospels then, in the opinion of these learned Christians, were originally compiled from *anonymous* writings, which had gone through different hands and been variously altered, and added to in the passage, before they became the BASIS!! of our present Gospels.\*

Lastly, he will discover, that since their con-

\* If this opinion be true, and Bishop Marsh may be considered as having almost demonstrated it to be so in his dissertation upon the origin of the three first Gospels, it follows, that these Gospels, could not have been written by the Apostles, and immediate followers of Jesus Christ; for certainly, men personally and intimately acquainted with all his actions, and all his doctrines, (as were his Apostles and all his immediate followers, and influenced too by the Holy Ghost, as they are all represented to have been in the book of Acts, ch. iv. 31,) in setting about writing Memoirs of Jesus, would write from their *own complete, inspired and personal* knowledge; and would not compile from "books which had gone through various hands, and been variously altered and added to in the passage." No! such a procedure would be that of men, who had *no personal knowledge* of the events they undertook to record; and who were therefore *obliged* to consult books for information.

In order to place in a fair light the absurdity of supposing the four Gospels to have been written by the Apostles and first followers of Jesus, I will suppose a case. Suppose there should appear in the world, four different Lives of Napoleon *pretending* to have been written by four of his aids de-camp, who had constantly been near his person, from the time that he commanded the troops in Paris till his dethronement: and that one of them represented that the expedition to Egypt took place when he was General of the troops in Paris, another that it took place when he was first Consul, and the others that it took place when he was Emperor. Would any man believe, that ALL these books were written by aids de-camp of Napoleon, who had been constantly near his person from the time that he commanded the troops of Paris till his dethronement?

struction from such nameless materials, they have been further altered and interpolated. Celsus accuses the Christians of his time (the latter part of the 2nd century) of "continually altering their Gospels;" and the ancient Christian sects accuse each other of the same fact. That these accusations were well founded, is evident from Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament; where besides the notice of some hundred thousands of various readings, we find not only single words, but whole phrases, and verses, and even entire paragraphs rejected as corruptions and interpolations. Neither have all these corruptions been accidental; for as much as the strongest text in the New Testament, in support of the doctrine of the Trinity and the Divinity of Jesus Christ, which is to be found in the first Epistle, called of John ch. v. 7, "there are three that bear witness in Heaven. The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost and these three are one," has been struck out of the text by Griesbach, himself a Trinitarian, as a *pious fraud*, and is now I believe universally acknowledged as such by learned Christians.

There are also, two other passages which for ages have been cited as proofs of the Divinity of Jesus (viz. "The Church of *God* which he has redeemed with his own blood," Acts ch. xx. 28. and "God was manifested in the flesh," in the first Epistle to Timothy, ch. iii. 16.) which the same Critic has proved to have been altered from their original reading to favour the same doctrine; and it is impossible to say *how many more* frauds of a similar nature might be detected, if the learned and candid Christians before-mentioned were in possession of the primitive manuscripts of the New Testament.\*

\* The New Testament, is I believe unparalleled among all the ancient books that have come down to us for the



All these enormities Mr. Everett, who has a light hand in writing upon some subjects, comprizes with great tenderness in the following expressions, "our copies of the New Testament by *the lapse of time*, have suffered some *literal* alterations, which may have fallen occasionally on the quoted texts (he is trying to justify the writers of the New Testament, for quoting the Old Testament otherwise than it is written) and thus made them to differ from the reading of the Old Testament," p. 279.

number, and importance of the corruptions, and alterations, it has undergone. What! can learned Christians tell us of several hundred thousands of various readings, in copies of a small book like the New Testament—that almost every, perhaps *every* verse has been altered, interpolated, or retrenched in some copy or other—and then add in the same breath that the book is nevertheless to be received, as containing the *uncorrupted* doctrines of the founders of Christianity? If we did not know the inconsistency, and blindness of prejudice, one might be tempted to suspect that these learned men were hardly sincere.

What! is it to be insisted on that a book which Providence has evidently abandoned to carelessness, or to roguery, or to both, was nevertheless intended by the Supreme, as a *credible* record of an *ultimate*, permanent and *universal* religion for all mankind!!—The insane effrontery of such a supposition deserves to be hooted out of countenance.

Mr. Everett says, p. 243. of his work "that not one of the books of the New Testament, nor all of them together, were intended to be a forensic defence of Christianity. On the contrary, the historical books are brief, and *imperfect* memoirs, which were not designed, nor supposed to contain all the facts, and which do not set forth, nor profess to set forth the evidences of the religion. The Epistolary parts are the counsels, instructions and affectionate sentiments which the occasions of the infant churches, drew from their founders. Now from these we expect, to *collect* the whole of Christianity, of its doctrines, it's precepts, and it's sanctions." Can Mr. Everett confidely believe, that God Almighty, who descended to the earth, to deliver a Code to *one* nation would have *left the world to collect* as they could a complete, universal, and permanent code of religion and morals from "*brief and imperfect, interpolated and corrupted* memoirs, and a few occasional letters.?"

I have supposed that a reasonable and reasoning man, desirous to ascertain the truth of the religion of the Christians, and in the hope of finding it well founded, in the course of his examination of the testimony for the authenticity and authority of the books of the New Testament, comes to the knowledge of all these circumstances. If the reader be such a man, I would ask him, if he can rationally rest his belief in the moral attributes of God, and his faith in a future life, upon a foundation composed of such materials.?

Mr. Everett observes "that as prophecy and miracle are equally divine works, it is impossible that they should contradict each other. They are equally the works of the God of truth, and whatever contradiction there appears to be between them, must be but apparent. If a person of whatever pretensions proposes to work miracles in support of those pretensions, in which nevertheless he is contradicted by express prophecy, one of these things is certain—that the prophecy is a forged one—or that we have mistaken the meaning of it—or that the miracles are not real," p. 3. of Mr. Everett's work.

Granted—upon this ground I think that Mr. Everett can fairly be brought to issue. I presume that he will hardly persist in maintaining that the Gospels are a sufficient proof of the miracles they record, in the face of the objections to their authenticity and authority already stated—and as neither he nor myself maintain that the prophecies, with regard to the Messiah, contained in the Old Testament were forged, it remains only to be considered, whether he or I have mistaken the meaning of them. So that, as I have repeatedly said in my former publications, the prophets, after all, are the only criterion which can be appealed to for a decision of the question at issue; a question



certainly most important to the great interests of humanity, were it only on this account, that the dispute has occasioned the most unparalled degradation, misery, and oppression to one of the parties to it.\*

\* Mr. Everett recommends to me to adopt as an appropriate motto for the second edition of my first work, a passage from Celsus which speaks of the dispute, between the Jews and Christians as a "quarrel about the shadow of an ass." p. 327. of Mr. Everett's work.

Is it so indeed ! How then has it happened that Mr. Everett's Coreligionists have for fifteen hundred years persecuted, despised, oppressed, trampled under foot millions, plundered and massacred hundreds of thousands, tortured, racked, and roasted alive thousands of the Jewish nation ; and all in a quarrel about "the shadow of an ass !" O shame, where is thy blush. O meek eye'd humanity, how hast thou been outraged and trampled on !

For my own part I do not consider it as a quarrel about "the shadow of an ass," I rather think it has a much greater resemblance to a quarrel about *an ass in the Lion's skin* ; in which quarrel the Christians have shown themselves to be every thing but the Fox in the Fable upon that subject.

## PEBBLE II.

---

“The Messiah expected by the Jews,” says Mr. Everett, at the beginning of the second chapter of his book, “and which Mr. English supposes to be predicted in the Old Testament, is “a temporal prince, and a conquering pacificator.” The Christians on the other hand maintain, that the prophets foretold not a political, but a religious institution, not a temporal prince, but a moral teacher, and spiritual Saviour. Which of these opposite views of the predicted character of the Messiah is correct, must be decided of course by an appeal to particular predictions. But it is also a matter of reason, and we have a right to argue upon the question from the character of God, and the nature of man. Which of these views the Jewish or the Christian doth most commend itself to the sincere believer in the moral government of God, and the rational and accountable nature of man?”

This statement, I cannot help considering as both artful and unfair. That I have represented the Messiah as predicted to be “a temporal Prince and a conquering pacificator,” is true, but it is not *the whole truth*; Mr. Everett would have it to be understood, that I maintained that the Messiah

was to be *merely* “a temporal Prince;” whereas, those who will take the trouble to refer to the prior chapters of “the grounds of Christianity examined,” will find that I have endeavoured to prove that the prophets predict, that he was also to be “a just, beneficent, wise, and mighty monarch, under whose government righteousness was to flourish, and mankind be made happy:” and I believe that there is not a single passage from the prophets quoted in Mr. Everett’s 2d. chapter to prove his views of the Messiah, that I have not also myself quoted to prove the beneficent character of him I suppose to be predicted.

Mr. Everett unwarily betrays his own unfairness in the following passage of his work, p. 63.—“Mr. English objects, that whereas the first characteristic of the Messiah was, that he was to be *the Prince of Peace*, in whose time righteousness was to flourish and mankind be made happy,” &c.\*

How is it possible, I might ask Mr. Everett that I could have maintained that the Messiah was to be *merely* “a temporal Prince, and a conquering pacificator,” when it is also true, as Mr. Everett confesses, that I maintain that “the *first characteristic* of the Messiah was that he was to be *Prince of Peace*, in whose time righteousness was to flourish and mankind be made happy?” I c

\* Mr. Everett, also quotes my words in another place into the 211. page of his work. “The Jews had certainly good reason from their prophecies, to expect no Messiah but one who should set on the Throne of David, and confer Liberty and happiness on them, and spread peace and happiness throughout the earth, and communicate the knowledge of God and virtue, and the love of their fellow men to every people.”

Is this a character “whose laurel is to be watered by tears,” the leaves of which is to “grow green in an atmosphere filled with sighs and groans?” I would ask Mr. Everett,



fess, that I feel both contempt and indignation at such an artful mis-representation of my opinions, in order to attack them with more hopes of success; and as I do not profess to be a Christian, I may be excused for expressing what in this case I certainly have a right so feel.\*

The prophets, *literally understood*, represent (as Mr. Everett will not deny) that the Messiah is to be a mighty Monarch, enthroned at Jerusalem, under whose reign the Jews should be restored to their country, and converted from their sins and errors, and established in the most perfect and endless happiness; that he will put down all opposition to his authority, and exterminate the wicked out of the earth, and unite the pious and good of all the human race under his government, making them participators of the eternal happiness of the favoured descendants of Abraham, that all

\* Mr. Everett says page, 107. with great gravity, "to hear the Evangelists charged in vulgar terms with misquoting and changing words, by one, who could himself fall into the errors and the misrepresentations we have just exposed, has moved me to a warmth of language, which I did not think to have used. But, I beg pardon: it is the New Testament which teaches us, that we "*beware lest we condemn ourselves, in what we judge another*" And Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ let us know that the New Testament morality is pernicious to society. Justly, most justly, does Dr. Leland observe, that "it would be hard to produce any persons whatever, who are chargeable with more unfair, and fraudulent management in their quotations, in *curtailing*, adding to, and *altering the passages they cite*, or taking them out of their connexion, and *making them speak directly contrary to the sentiments of their authors* than the Deistical Writers!!" They are indeed sad dogs, it must be allowed, Mr. Everett.

sin, sorrow, and error shall be no more, and the earth become all Paradise

“Far more bless’d than that of Eden,  
And far happier days.”\*

The difference between Mr. Everett’s and my view of this representation is, that I understand the prophets to mean that the whole will be literally fulfilled; and Mr. Everett maintains that, *that part* which accords with the Christian view of the Messiah *is to be* literally understood, but that that part which is opposed to it must be taken *figuratively*.

Who is so blind as not to perceive the motives for such an incoherent system of interpretation! The passages which represent the Messiah as a Monarch reigning at Jerusalem, and whose temporal authority should extend over all the earth, Mr. Everett would interpret to signify, (by a *figure*) “a preacher of righteousness, and a spiritual Saviour of the souls of men;” because Jesus had no temporal authority whatever, and therefore to understand them literally would exclude the claims set up for him. The earth’s being restored to a Paradisiacal state, and the extinction of all sin, violence, and misery throughout its circumference, Mr. Everett would interpret to signify, (by a *figure*) “the *blessed* events,” which have occurred, and the “*changes that have taken place*,” since the promulgation of Christianity!!†

\* See Appendix, B.

† Mr. Everett considers the happy reign of the Messiah as having actually commenced with the æra of Jesus Christ, and that we are actually enjoying its blessings. Of course he must consider his being whipped, and gibbeted by his own subjects, and leaving the world in the hands of those holy men, Tiberius, Nero, Caligula, Domitian, and Heliogabalus, kingdom rising against kingdom, and nation against nation; (though the prophets declare that in the reign of

Mr. Everett, in support of his system of interpretation, shows us, that the Supreme Being is frequently spoken of in the Old Testament, as a King and as a victorious warrior; and therefore infers, because *such passages* must be understood figuratively, that the passages in the prophets which speak of the Messiah in *similar terms*, must be also understood figuratively.

To this it seems to me to be a sufficient answer

the Messiah "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more,") famines, earthquakes, and pestilences in divers places, (though the prophets declare that in the reign of the Messiah, the earth shall become a Paradise, and that God shall wipe all tears from off all faces, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away,) that horrid Jewish war in which perished more than eleven hundred thousand of the Jewish nation, while the rest were dispersed and enslaved, (though the prophets say, that in the reign of the Messiah the Jews should enjoy the most perfect and endless happiness,) the theological quarrels, frauds, forgeries, Councils, and Excommunications, and an endless detail of Battle and Murder, the irruptions and devastations of the Goths Huns and Vandals, the rise and establishment of "these venerable institutions," the Popedom and the Inquisition, the persecutions and wars excited by St. Dominic, the wars of Charlemagne, and the Teutonic Knights upon the Germans, giving them no alternative but the Gospel or the Sword, the Crusades, the pious exploits of Cortez and Pizarro in America, the comfortable state of things during the dark ages, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the wars carried on by the Catholics against the Protestants, and the wars since carried on by the Protestants and Catholics, indiscriminately with each other, as among those "*blessed events, and happy changes,*" I use Mr. Everetts words, intended by "the highly figurative language," of the Old Testament prophets predictive of the reign of the Messiah! If the reader will pursue those predictions contained in Appendix, B. or that beautiful compend of them Pope's "Messiah" he will I believe allow, that if it were possible for such things as the above mentioned, to be really intended by those prophecies, they would be the greatest hoax, and the most flagrant and enormous verification of the old proverb "*parturiunt montes nascitur ridiculus mus,*" on record.



to observe, that men who speak of the Deity, are obliged to employ human language and human ideas ; because

“ What can we reason but from what we know ? ” and therefore a great part of such language will be necessarily figurative ; but it by no means follows from this, that the writers who are obliged to use this figurative language when speaking of the Deity, intend to be understood in the *same sense* when they apply the same expressions to describe men and their actions. On the contrary, as they were writing to men and for men, it is natural to presume, that they meant to be understood in the way that such expressions are universally understood by all men, when they relate to men and their actions. Such a system of interpretation as this of Mr. Everett’s, turns the Bible into a Babel of confusion : a man proceeding upon this system, might with equal plausibility turn all the good and prosperous kings of Israel and Judah into “ Spiritual Saviours.”\*

“ What, says Mr. Everett, p. 63. would be thought of one, who after making a collection of passages which ascribe these attributes of royalty and conquest to God, such as Mr. English has made of those which ascribe such attributes to the Messiah, should infer as he does, that God is a just, beneficent, wise and mighty monarch reigning on a throne in Jerusalem ? ”

To this I answer by asking in my turn, what should we think of one, who after making a collection, of passages which ascribe these attributes of royalty and conquest to God, as Mr. Everett has done, should therefore think himself authorised to infer, that the history of David the son of Jesse, contain-

\* It is worth notice that when the term “ Saviour,” is applied in the Old Testament to *men*, it invariably signifies a temporal deliverer, for instance, Judges iii. 9. 15, in the Hebrew.

ed in the Bible, (which, as all the world knows, is an oriental book abounding in figurative expressions) was not to be understood *literally*, but that it was very possible that this supposed monarch of Israel, who is represented as having "saved it from its enemies on every side," was after all, probably only a *spiritual saviour* of the *souls* of the Israelites, by having distinguished himself as a prophet, a preacher of righteousness, and a composer of Psalms !!\*

As Mr. Everett says, I "cheerfully leave this part of the controversy, with the answer to this question which every rational inquirer will give," p. 63.

Mr. Everett, however, in maintaining that the Messiah was to be merely a preacher of righteousness, a founder of a new religion, and a spiritual saviour of the souls of men, not only opposes the dicta of the prophets of the Old Testament, but is *expressly contradicted by the doctrine of the New*, which maintains the same ideas of the Messiah that the prophets teach and the Jews believe; and

\* The writers of the Old Testament frequently speak of the head, hands, ears, eyes, and even nostrils of the Deity. Will Mr. Everett infer, that because these expressions must be understood figuratively, that whenever the sacred writers speak of heads, hands, ears, eyes, and noses of men, that said heads, hands, ears, eyes, and noses had *no physical existence*, but must be interpreted *figuratively*? If so, I do not despair of seeing Mr. Everett publish a Dissertation, crowded by numerous quotations from the Rabbies, in order to prove, that the history of David's cutting off the head of Goliath, was in all probability merely a *figurative account*, in the oriental style, of the success of the *prophet David* in a *controversy* he had with a certain Philistine Heathen Priest of the God Dagon, ("strange sea monster, upward man, and downward fish:") who had written a book in order to prove against the Israelites, that their law was "a dead letter," and they themselves no "nation."



this with the indulgence of the reader's patience I will plainly show.

The angel is recorded, Luke, ch. i. 31, to have told Mary, concerning Jesus whom the author of that Gospel supposes to have been the Messiah, that "the Lord God shall give unto him *the throne* of his father David: and *he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever*, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Now this is precisely the doctrine, concerning the Messiah, believed by the Jews from that time to the present; for we see that Luke represents that the Messiah was *not* to be merely a spiritual saviour of the souls of men, but was actually to set upon the throne of David, and reign over the house of Jacob for ever: which is precisely what the prophets teach and the Jews believe.

Again, in the same ch. 68, the writer of that Gospel represents Zecharias, when filled with the Holy Ghost, as predicting concerning Jesus as follows. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath *visited* and *redeemed* his people, and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David: *as he spake* by the mouth of his holy prophets which have been since the world began: that we should be *saved from our enemies*, and *from the hand of all that hate us*: to perform the mercy promised to our Fathers, and to remember his holy covenant: the oath which he swore to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us, that we being delivered from the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life."

Here we see again, that in Luke's opinion the Messiah was not to be merely "a spiritual saviour of the souls of men," but that he was to "save Israel from their enemies and from the hand of all

that hated them," and this too is precisely what the prophets teach and the Jews believe.

Again, from the first ch. of Acts 6. it is evident, that the primitive Christians did not believe that the Messiah was to be merely a spiritual saviour of the souls of men, but that he would perform for Israel what was promised by the prophets. For the Apostles are represented there as asking Jesus, previous to his ascension, saying "Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?"

The way the writers of the New Testament, get over the objection to the Messiahship of Jesus, founded on the non-fulfilment by him of the splendored visions of the prophets relative to the restoration of the dispersion, the punishment of their oppressors, and the diffusion of universal happiness to the tribes and to the world, (which they represent as the consequence of the coming of the Messiah) is, not by maintaining that the Messiah was to be merely "a spiritual Saviour of the souls of men," but by affirming that Jesus would *shortly come again into the world* to fulfill them. "The Lord Jesus," says the writer of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians ch. i. 7," "shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of our Lord, and from the glory of his power: when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired of all them that believe."\*

\* Paul in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians appears to say, as he affirms "*by the word of the Lord*," that the second coming of Jesus to do all this, should take place during the life time of the generation to whom he was writing; for he says 1 Thess. ch. iv. 15, speaking of the Chris-

Again, in the xii. ch. of the Revelations, Jesus is apparently spoken of as destined "to rule all nations with a rod of iron." And in the ii. ch. Jesus is represented as saying, that "he that overcometh and keepeth my words unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers even as I received of my Father," v. 26, and lastly, not to be tedious, there is a passage in the xix. ch. of Revelations, which proves decisively against Mr. Everett, that the primitive Christians had even more sanguinary ideas of the vengeance of the Messiah upon the wicked of the earth, than are even entertained by the Jews. Jesus is there described thus, "I saw Heaven opened, and behold a

tians who had died before he wrote, "this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that *we* which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God; and the dead in Christ should rise first. Then *we* which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

The Gospels represent Jesus as saying, that there were some of that generation who should not taste of death till they saw him come in the manner that Paul describes. For Mark, in the xiii. ch. of his Gospel, after representing Jesus as prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem, says that his discourse at that time went on as follows.

"But in those days after that tribulation, (i. e. after the siege and destruction of Jerusalem) the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light. And the stars of Heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in Heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory, and then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of Heaven. Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass till all these things be done. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Mark, xiii. 24, &c.



white horse; and he that set upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and *make war*; and out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should *smite the nations*; and he shall *rule them with a rod of iron*, and he treadeth the wine press of *the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God*," v. 11, 15. Some idea of the slaughter meant by the writer of the Revelations by "treading the wine press of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God," may be understood from ch. xiv. 20, where it is represented that the blood of men came out of this wine press "by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs!!"

I suppose that the reader is quite satisfied by what has been adduced, that Mr Everett's idea of the Messiah's being *merely* "a spiritual saviour of the souls of men," is equally rejected by the Old Testament and the New, and since Mr Everett does not and cannot pretend, that Jesus during the long space of 1800 years has fulfilled the predictions relating to the Messiah in a literal sense, which is the sense in which they must be fulfilled in order to be *made good*, Mr. Everett is left without better proof of the Messiahship of Jesus than *bare opinion only*, which attaineth not to any certainty.

Mr. Everett supposes that a mere "Preacher of righteousness," is capable of fulfilling all the predictions of the Messiah, which represent him as putting an end to all wickedness and misery throughout the World. How absurd! there never was, a better or greater "Preacher of righteousness," than Jesus Christ himself, and what did he effect among the people of his age? the Gospels say, that they whipped him, and nailed him to a cross. There has been since his time, for eighteen hundred years, I know not how many millions of "preachers of righteousness," and what have they

effected? look at the history of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire: look at the histories of mankind for the last 400 years. What scenes do they for the most part, present to the shocked contemplation! are they not generally a complication of folly, madness, and devilism, worthy of being recorded in triumph by the *evil one* himself, in letters of blood and infernal fire?

What success have the "Preachers of righteousness," of the present day? Do not these pious and good men, and pious and good they generally speaking undoubtedly are, do they not feel themselves obliged to tell you, that such is the depravity of human nature, that "teaching and preaching are all in vain;" that they are wearying themselves in "throwing pearls before swine," who receive them with a grunt, and "trample them under their feet?"

Does not Mr. Everett himself tell us p. 80, that "it is too true that the mighty passions, which agitate the public intercourse of the world, are almost beyond the *direct* reach of moral means," i. e. of the "Preachers of righteousness."

How then can he expect that a mere "Preacher of righteousness," is capable of subduing these "mighty passions," whose existence is incompatible with peace and happiness, and fulfilling the predictions relating to the Messiah? No, all history and experience testify that no merely human power *can* put an end to them. It must be done by the strong and armed hand of Heaven.

Then, and not till then, shall exiled "justice look down from Heaven, and righteousness and peace shall kiss each other." Then, and not till then, shall "the wicked cease from troubling;" and the afflicted enjoy happiness.

"These be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up

on high, the Messiah of the God of Jacob, (See the Heb.) and the sweet Psalmist of Israel; *The spirit of Jehovah spake by me, and his word is in my tongue.* The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, he that ruleth over mankind (see the Heb.) shall be just, ruling in the fear of God: And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.

But the *sons of Belial* shall be all of them as thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with hands. But the man that shall touch them *must be fenced with iron*, and the staff of a spear; and they shall be utterly burned with fire in the same place." 2 Sam. ch. xxiii.



### PEBBLE III.

Let us, however, follow Mr. Everett in the consideration of those prophecies, which he says p. 83, "are really to be regarded as proofs of the (Christian) religion."

It is not necessary for me to say any thing further, in defence of the interpretation of the prophecy in Deut. xviii. 15, contained in my first publication, where I consider it as referring to *a succession* of inspired messengers from God to the Israelites; because Mr. Everett *allows*, that "in granting that this interpretation is correct, we should only follow the example of the most learned and judicious Christian interpreters," p. 84.

I will pass therefore to the passage in the Psalm xvi. 10. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; (i. e. the place of the departed,) nor suffer thy Saints (or thy pious ones\*) to see *destruction*," as I have translated it. Mr. Everett maintains that the word translated by me in this place "*destruction*," sometimes means "*corruption*." Granted, but Mr. Everett will not deny that the original word sometimes signifies "*destruction*," and as-

\* Mr. Everett has produced some authorities which make it doubtful whether the genuine reading in this place was "thy saints or thy pious ones," in the plural, or thy "saint, or thy pious one; in the singular. The matter is not worth disputing about, if it be made evident that the Psalm refers to David.

surely therefore I have as good a right to translate it my way, as he has to interpret it to signify "corruption."\* I maintain, moreover, that I have a better right in this place to translate it "destruction," than he has to render it "corruption;" if the whole psalm manifestly relates to David, as is I think evident from the context, whose body underwent the natural decomposition occasioned by death; which therefore necessitates the translation I have given if the psalm relates to David which I think is evident.

"I have set the Lord always before *me*, because he is at *my* right hand I shall not be moved. Therefore *my* heart is glad, and *my* glory rejoiceth, *my* flesh shall also rest in hope: for thou wilt not leave *my* soul in hell, nor suffer thy saints (or thy pious one) to see destruction. Thou wilt show *me* the path of life, in thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures for ever more." Since therefore the psalm evidently relates to David, I do not see how it is a prophecy of Jesus' rising from the dead on the third day after his crucifixion, as it is said to have been applied to prove, by Peter in the book of Acts ch. ii.

I would observe also, that the modern German Theological scholars, who as Mr. Everett says (p. 247. of his work,) "are supposed to excell in Criti-

\* Mr. Everett p. 87. of his work, in trying to prove that the original word signifies "corruption," has unhappily produced a passage which not only proves nothing in his favour, but a great deal in mine. "Therefore, says Daniel, I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me, for my comeliness was turned in me into *corruption* ("the word here in the original is from the same root as that, in the 16 Psalm translated by me destruction?") and I retained no strength." Dan. x. 8. Most commentators on this passage, I believe, suppose that Daniel meant to signify that he was *petrified* at the sight of the angel, and that his physical faculties were suspended through terror. Does Mr. Everett suppose, that the prophet meant to signify that he was actually *putrified* at the sight of Gabriel?

cal learning," do allow and maintain, by the confession of Mr. Everett himself p. 247 of his work, that this passage in the psalms is *not* a prophecy of Jesus, no more than any of the others adduced in the New Testament from the Old, but that it is quoted merely by way of accommodation or allusion.

I presume therefore that Mr. Everett will cease to regard this passage as one of "the prophecies," which are really to be regarded as *proofs* of the Christian religion.

The next passage of the Old Testament, which Mr. Everett relies on as a prophetic proof of the Christian religion, is the 2nd. psalm; "why did the *nations* (according to the Heb.) rage, and the *peoples* (ac. to the Heb.) imagine a vain thing. The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against Jehovah, and against his Messiah saying, let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us," &c. To the application of this prophecy to Jesus, I objected in my first publication, on account of these reasons, 1st. That "the nations," as it is in the original, did not assemble to crucify Jesus, as this was done by a few soldiers." To this Mr. Everett replies, p. 90. of his work, that "the Apostle (Peter in Acts ch. iv. 45,) does not say, they assembled to "crucify him," their joint opposition was not limited to this single act, they were gathered together against him. And it is certainly true, that Jesus was an object of the united persecution of the nation of the Jews, by means of their bigotted priests and furious multitudes, and of the Romans, by means of their tributary sovereign Herod, and their Proconsul Pilate." In reply to this I would observe, that the words "nations," and "peoples," in the original of the passage never signified the Jewish nation, but are used in the Hebrew Bible to signify



all other nations but the Jews, or what is expressed by the word "Gentiles."

Now it is said in the psalm, that "the nations and peoples," (exclusive of the Jews for the reason above-mentioned) should *rage* and that "the kings of the earth should stand up, and the rulers (of the earth,) *take counsel* against Jehovah, and against his Messiah." I do not see, therefore, how this passage could have been fulfilled by the Romans, who were but *one* nation, by means of their Proconsul Pilate and his soldiers: who (the Romans) were so far too from being *enraged* against Jesus, that it is certain, that all the Romans out of Jerusalem, did not even know what was doing against him, and Pilate himself was so far from being "enraged," and "taking counsel," against Jesus, that he *befriended* him as far as he dared, and made great exertions to save his life.

Moreover, in the psalm, these "nations and peoples, and kings and rulers," are represented as saying "let us break *their* bands in sunder, and cast away *their* cords from us." This passage refers to the Messiah and the Jewish nation taken together, whom the Old Testament represents as to have "dominion over all peoples, nations and languages," and that "the nation and people that will not serve them shall perish, yea those nations shall be utterly wasted." Is. lx.\*

\* "Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two edged sword in their hand. To execute vengeance upon the nations, and punishments upon the peoples: To bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them *the judgment written*; this honour have all his saints. Praise ye Jehovah. Ps. cxlix. This passage alludes to the same doctrine: there are many in the psalms and prophets of the same import. It is but justice however to the Hebrew prophets to add, that they hold the balance of justice between Jew and Gentile very fairly, in representing that on account of the superior light vouchsafed to the former, God would punish them

Therefore, these refractory nations and kings could not, and actually never have said this of Jesus, who was but an *individual*, to whom the expression "*their* bands and *their* cords," cannot apply: and finally, since Mr. Everett maintains that Jesus was "merely a spiritual saviour of the souls of men," I do not see how he can consider him as a character pretending to impose "bands and cords," upon any body.

2. I had also objected to the application of this prophecy to Jesus, because "God has not set Jesus as his king upon the holy hill of Sion, (as the psalm imports) nor given him the nations for his inheritance, nor the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." To this Mr. Everett, p. 91, replies in the usual way, i. e. after interpreting as much of the psalm, as he thinks he can make accord with the history of Jesus, in a *literal* sense, he interprets this passage of the Messiah's being enthroned on Mount Sion, which he *cannot* make accord with it, in a *figurative* one. The reader must judge whether this be fair or reasonable.

The latter part of the psalm, Mr. Everett contends, was fulfilled by the rapid spread of Christianity; and he quotes, in proof of this, some passages of the Fathers. To this I would reply, that those passages of the Fathers are notorious exaggerations, and convicted of falsehood by Middleton in his *Free Inquiry*.

And lastly, I would observe, that even those nations who have embraced Christianity, can by no means be called the inheritance or subjects of Jesus; since they have since the days of Constantine

"double for all their sins;" and that before they shall be advanced to the eternal supremacy promised them, the most terrible trials and severities shall exterminate the wicked and worthless from the nation.

and the Counsel of Nice renounced his doctrines, and perverted his religion into "a fabulous, irrational and blasphemous superstition,"\* for as much as all of them, except a handful of Unitarian Christians, are worshippers of three Divine Beings united by an ineffable union; and by *far the greater part* of them are adorers of idols, images, and pictures.† And if I may, without offence, be allowed to express the sincere opinion of my heart upon this subject, I would say, that it is my serious belief, that if Jesus the son of Mary could return into the world, and learn, that his professed followers had placed him between the Cherubim, at the right hand of the Almighty, worshipping him as "God equal to the Father," as, "God of God, very God of every God:" and that by far the greater part had also placed Mary his mother on the other side of the Deity, worshipping her as "the mother of God!"‡ he would in my opinion renounce and de-

\* Which is of the same family as the religion of Thibet. The Christians believe that God became incarnate in the infant Jesus. The Thibetians and Chinese believe that God is incarnate in the person of the Grand Lama. And each of them considers the other as "ignorant and deluded idolators."

† All the Christians throughout the world, except the Protestants who do not constitute more than a fifth of the Christian world, kneel and pray before the crucifix, images and pictures of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the Saints. Their churches are crowded with images and pictures, before which they burn lamps, tapers, and incense. The great toe of the right foot of an ancient bronze statue of Jupiter, christened St. Peter, in the magnificent Church of St. Peter at Rome, is nearly worn off by the devout kisses and rubbings of the worshippers of that Saint! If the spirit of the Unitarian Jew Peter, could animate that statue, I believe that the foot of it would have long since kicked the teeth down the throat of some of his worshippers. See *Appendix, G. G.*

‡ That Mary is "*the Mother of God!*" is the creed of all the Christian sects except the Protestants, and Nestorians.

The European and Asiatic Christian churches, except a precious handful of Unitarians, appear to act upon the principles of the old Samaritans. So these nations feared Jehovah, and



nounce them as impious heathens, and possibly believe that they were possessed with devils.

The next passage which Mr. Everett quotes as a prophecy of Jesus, is the 2d verse of the 5th chapter of Micah, "and thou Bethlehem Ephratah, it is little to be among the thousands of Judah; out of thee shall come forth unto me, him who is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been of old, from the days of ancient years:" [according to the Hebrew.] This I interpreted to signify, not that the birth of the Messiah should be *in* Bethlehem, but the descent of the Messiah should be *derived from* Bethlehem, i. e. from Jesse the father of David; (and that therefore a future Messiah who should be derived from this family, would fulfil the prophecy;) and this interpretation, I represent as being known

served their graven images, both their children, and their children's children; as did their Fathers, so do they unto this day." 2 Kings, xvii. 41. Their religion is as inconsistent and inconsequent as the conduct of Nebuchadnezzar; who "answered unto Daniel, and said, of a truth it is that your God is a God of Gods, and a Lord of Lords;" Dan. ch. ii. 47. And who, notwithstanding, set up an idol of gold, and commanded all peoples, nations, and languages to fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up: and threatened that whoso falleth not down and worshippeth should be cast into a burning fiery furnace." ch. iii.—and who on another occasion "acknowledged and blessed the most high, and praised and honoured him that liveth for ever and ever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation:" ch. iv. and who notwithstanding destroyed his Temple, and lodged its sacred vessels in the treasure house of his idol. The service of the Christian churches not Protestant resembles Bellshazzar's feast. They drink out of the golden and silver vessels, which *they have* "*taken out of the Temple of the house of God which was in Jerusalem,*" and praise the Gods of gold, of silver, of brass, of wood, and of stone,\* which see not, nor hear, nor know. And the result of the business, if the Old Testament predict the truth, will be, that the mysterious menaces written by the figures of God, will be fulfilled in confusion, wo, and destruction.

\* I allude to the crucifixes, images, and pictures of Christ, the Virgin Mary and the Saints, with which all Christian churches not protestant are filled.

and acknowledged by Hebrew scholars. "But the truth is, says Mr. Everett p. 94, that the original word, [translated by *me* "shall come forth,"] is familiarly used of the birth of a man, as "Mizraim begat Pathrusim, and Casluhim *out of whom* came Philistim," Gen. x. 13, 14. This is a very awkward quotation on the part of Mr. Everett, as it says nothing in favour of his views, but directly favours mine: for *Philistim* is a word in the plural number, and is used in the Hebrew Bible, to express "the Philistines;" and the word translated "*come*" is also in the plural number, see Simon's Hebrew Bible. The passage therefore in Genesis x. 13. 14. imports that the Philistines were *derived* or descended from Mizraim. "Who the Hebrew scholars are, says Mr. Everett, who acknowledge this turn of the passage [in Micah,] I know not," p. 94 of Mr. Everett's work. If I were writing in Europe or America, I think that I could point them out; but if my memory does not deceive me, Grotius interprets the passage of the *derivation* of the Messiah from Bethlehem: and Mr. Everett will not deny that the modern Christian Hebrew scholars of Germany, *disallow* that this passage has any reference to Jesus, and affirm that it is quoted in the New Testament, Matthew ii. 5., only by way of allusion or accommodation.

I had however, in order to show that this prophecy could not be insisted on by the Christians, said by way of argument, that allowing "that Bethlehem was to be the birth place of the Messiah, what then? will a man's being born in Bethlehem, be *sufficient* to make him the Messiah foretold by the Hebrew prophets!"

This Mr. Everett seizes hold on in the following way, p. 95. "Now if we were willing to be consistent, and cling to our principles wherever they carry us, it would almost seem that this concession might

decide the controversy. The Messiah is to be of Bethlehem. This reduces to a little span, the number of those among whom he can be found. Moreover, Bethlehem is now in ruins, to all moral purposes its indenty is gone.\* It is the habitation of Turks, of Arabs, of Christians; and if there be any Jews there, none will pretend that the divisions of the tribes are preserved among them, so that the tribe of David, from whom the Messiah is to arise, is known in Bethlehem from the rest. Neither can it be argued that hereafter when the Jews are restored, Bethlehem will be repeopled with Jews, the family of David be discriminated, and the prophecy admit of fulfilment, because Mr. English himself allows it to be the sense of prophecy, that the Messiah shall be born before the restoration. It only remains therefore to look back, and to see, of all that have appeared in Bethlehem, which has the greatest claim to this character."

On this reasoning I would observe, 1st, that my concession on which it is founded is merely gratuitous; as the words "shall come forth" signify merely *derivation*; 2nd, that Mr. Everett is mistaken in supposing that Bethlehem is now in ruins. It is at present probably nearly as large and populous as it ever was. 3d, Mr. Everett is mistaken, in supposing that the family of David cannot be traced among the Jews. There are at this moment in the world, many families *allowed* by their bretheren to be descended from David. Should any of the Jews go to Bethlehem at any time to come, and have a male child born to him in that place, for aught that can be known beforehand, that child may be the Messiah and the prophecy be *fulfilled in Mr. Everett's sense*

\*This is incorrect, Bethlehem is at present one of most populous cities in Palestine.



of it; which I repeat *cannot be insisted on*, as “come forth” certainly may signify, and in the case unluckily quoted by Mr. Everett, (Gen. x. 13. 14.) certainly does import, *derivation*.\*

The next passage, adduced by Mr. Everett, is the 10th v. of the ix. ch. of Zechariah, “Rejoice greatly O! daughter of Zion, shout O! daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy king cometh unto thee: he is just and *saved*, lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.”

Mr. Everett, after allowing that the Hebrew reads “*saved*” or “*preserved*,” instead of “*having salvation*,” as in the English version, observes, that many ancient versions read as in the English Bible. Whether the true reading be mine or his, is not of any consequence to the question to which this book relates. I maintain that *a man’s riding upon an ass into Jerusalem*, is *not sufficient* to prove him the Messiah.

I also repeat that the event predicted, is spoken of by the prophet as contemporaneous with the restoration of the division,† and of course could not have been fulfilled eighteen hundred years ago.

\* I request the reader to look at the Hebrew of Gen. x. 14. which Mr. Everett must have neglected to do; as otherwise I cannot account for his having referred to a passage which directly establishes my interpretation of the passage in Micah against his own. I trust that this little circumstance will induce Mr. Everett to have a fellow feeling for some errors which he says exists in my first publication. He will find some further proofs adduced from his book in the course of this work, of the truth of the old adage, “*humanum est errare*.”

† v. 10. of the ix. ch. of Zechariah, “and I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle-bow shall be cut off; [i. e. there shall be war no more,] and he [i. e. the Messiah,] shall speak peace unto the nations: and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.” Has this been yet fulfilled? or have the nations called Christians, for the last 1800 years, been more *peaceable* than others? on the contrary, is it not they who have *perfectionated* the arts of War and Destruction!

Mr. Everett tries to shove out this objection, by taking for granted, p. 98 of his work, that the chapter of Zechariah in which this prophecy is found, is a series of chronological predictions. But I must remind Mr. Everett that this pretention is inadmissible. None of the predictions of the prophets, except some in Daniel, are arranged in chronological order; they were delivered by parcels, and at intervals, frequently of some years; and these parcels generally have no connexion with each other. Mr. Everett's reasoning upon the assumption here contradicted, is therefore inadmissible.

Finally, the German Biblical Scholars so frequently mentioned, *deny* that this was a prediction of Jesus, and affirm that it is quoted by the Evangelists *merely* by way of accommodation.

The next passage adduced is Zechariah xii. 10., "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplications, and they shall look upon [or towards] *me*\* whom they have blasphemed, [or pierced,] and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for an only son."

\* "I render *me*," says Mr. Everett, "because I cheerfully allow with Eichorn and De Rossi in loco, that it is supported by most authorities." Why then does Mr. Everett abuse and insult me, p. 103. 104., for neglecting to notice the other reading he mentions, which he considers not to be the true one! If it be erroneotis, what is it good for, and if it be false, how has the inspired Evangelist quoted a false reading, (Gospel according to John ch. xix. 34. &c.,) in order to make out a prophecy?

I had objected in my first publication that the assertion of Stephen, when filled with the Holy Ghost, that "When Abraham went out of the land of the Chaldees, he dwelt in Haran, from thence, *after his father was dead*, God led him unto this land in which ye dwell." Acts vii. 4., directly contradicts the chapter in Genesis, where the story of Abraham's leaving Haran is related; for it is certain from thence, that Abraham left his father Zerah in Haran alive when he departed, and that he did not die till many years afterwards."

The meaning of this prophecy is obscure. The word translated "pierced" in the English version, may also in the opinion of Grotius, and I add of Rosenmuller too, as quoted by Mr. Everett in the 104. p. of his book, be best rendered "blasphemed or reproached." It may refer to the time when, according to the Old Testament, the hearts of the house of Israel shall be cleansed from sin, and they

On this Mr. Everett observes, "The difficulty is this, that Zerah is said in Genesis ch. 11. to have been seventy years old when Abraham was born, and to have lived two hundred and five years. But Abraham is also said to have left Haran when he was aged seventy-five years [Genesis xii. 14.]; at which time of course his Father was one hundred and forty-five years old, and therefore must have lived sixty years after his son Abraham left Haran. But Stephen in the passage in question says, that Abraham left Haran *after his Father was dead*. Now this direct contradiction is quite cleared up by the Samaritan copies of the Pentateuch, which give the whole age of Zerah exactly 145 years: and confirm the account of Stephen, that Abraham waited till the decease of his father, and then immediately left Haran. Had Mr. English no light upon this subject, but what he derived from his unlettered Rabbi, or even from the Commentators whose "troubles" he finds or feigns, one could not blame him for passing over this fact in silence. But I remember well the time, when Mr. English collected the text of the Samaritan copy as it stands in Kennicott's Bible, for the express purpose of ascertaining the diversity of the Hebrew and Samaritan texts. To suppress now a reading from this copy, which entirely removes his objection, argues a deplorable forgetfulness, or a willful fraud; and it would be a piece of affectation in me to speak of it in milder terms." p. 340. of Mr. Everetts work.

To put this courteous language to the blush, it is only necessary to observe, that the most distinguished Hebrew Critics [I think, if my memory does not deceive me, I may name De Rossi, for instance,] adhere to the reading of the Hebrew bible as the true one, and have not suffered themselves to be swayed by the strong Christian motives which have biassed Mr. Everett in this instance. Stephen, who was a Jew, would also never have given the preference to a reading of the Pentateuch of the Samaritan's, which also abounds with blunders. The Gentile author of the Book of Acts probably fabricated the speech.



shall turn to God "with their whole heart and with all their souls." as predicted by Moses.

I conclude with observing, that this passage, quoted in the New Testament; John ch. xix. has long since ceased to be considered as a prophecy of Jesus by the German Critics, and is believed by them, to have been adduced in the gospel merely by way of allusion. (See Rosenmuller's observations in his notes on the passage.)

I am afraid that the reader has found these discussions rather tedious, and am therefore happy to be at liberty to proceed to the consideration of the three famous prophecies of Jacob, Isaiah, and Daniel.

"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a Law-giver from between his feet for ever; for Shilo shall come, and to him shall the obedience of the peoples be ." Gen. xlix. 10. So I maintain the passage should be translated.

On this prediction I observed, (Grounds of Christianity Examined p. 43. as quoted by Mr. Everett.) "That though this prophecy is allowed by the Jews to refer to their Messiah, yet it does not define, nor limit the time of his coming. For that it is perfectly evident to all who will look at the place in the Hebrew Bible, that it is *pointed* to read, *not* "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a Law-giver from between his feet *until* Shilo come;" but "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his feet *for ever*; for Shilo shall come, and to him shall the gathering of the peoples be." So that the prophecy does not intimate that the Messiah should come *before* the sceptre be departed from Judah: but that it should not depart for ever, but shall be restored when Shilo comes."

On this Mr. Everett remarks, "now the *points*, commonly so called, have nothing to do with the division of a sentence into its members, or with

what we call *punctuation*; but Mr. English intended to intimate, that according to the *accents*, the verse should be divided as he proposes." (p. 110, of Mr. Everett's work.) In return for this friendly attempt to set me right, I would beg of Mr. Everett to peruse the following extract from the celebrated Alting's Treatise on Hebrew punctuation, which he will probably look over with blushing cheeks. "*Punctorum* appellatione venit, quicquid in Hebræa Scripturâ occurrit *præter literas*. Sunt vero punctorum genera tria; unum eorum quæ *sonum* moderantur; alterum illorum, quæ *Tonum* regunt, tertium merè *Criticorum* est quæ ad crisin masoretharum solummodò pertinent." p. 9. edit. Septimâ.

I do not think it necessary, to enter with Mr. Everett into the intricate dispute about the Hebrew accents, since he represents that they are of no authority in deciding the question between him and me, and because I think he will therefore not deny, that disregarding their authority, the passage *will bear* the rendering I have given it.

I shall therefore proceed to establish the interpretation I have given of the passage in Genesis, 1st. by endeavouring to show, that Mr. Everett's interpretation would convict the prophecy of falsehood, and 2dly. by showing that the interpretation I have given, is confirmed by the express declaration of God himself.

This prophecy was delivered by Jacob before there was any king in Judah. The sceptre *did* depart from Judah, and with a vengeance too, at the dethronement and captivity of Zedekiah, and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans: consequently if the sceptre was not to depart from Judah *till* Shilo came, the Messiah ought to have appeared before the dethronement of Zedekiah; as he certainly did not appear before that event, the

prophecy, according to Mr. Everett's sensible interpretation, would be falsified.

2. The sceptre never has been restored to Judah since the dethronement of Zedekiah; because the tribe of Judah, since that period, have been in subjection to the Babylonians, the Persians, the Syrians, the Romans, and all the world. Mr. Everett maintains that the sceptre of *Judah* was in the hands of that tribe during the time that it was held by the Romans who were of the tribe of *Levi* and the Herods who were *Idumæans*. This idea appears to me absurd, but I shall not give myself the trouble to oppose it by argument, as it can be set aside by the express declaration of God, as reported by Ezekiel, ch. xxi. 26. Speaking of Zedekiah and his dethronement, the prophet represented the Deity, as saying, "thus saith the Lord God, remove the diadem, take off the crown; this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, (i. e. the crown or sceptre of Judah,) and *it shall be no more until he comes whose right it is*, and I will give it him."

Here the Deity expressly declares, that from the dethronement of Zedekiah; the crown of Judah *should be no more* till the coming of the Messiah to whom he would give it. The Asmonæans and the Herods cannot therefore be considered as having held it, as Mr. Everett supposes.\*

\* Mr. Everett, in a note to p. 194 of his work, speaks of Salathiel and Zorobabel as succeeding to the "throne" of Judah after the Babylonish captivity. Any one who will read the books of Ezra and Nehemiah with attention, will be satisfied that this language is quite ridiculous: forasmuch as that Salathiel was a captive slave at Babylon, and Zorobabel was but at best the *Governor* of Judea for the King of Persia, and all the Jews under his command were subject to the orders of Tabnai and Shether Boznia "Go-



In order to be enabled to give a fair interpretation of it, it is first of all necessary to give a fair translation of it from the original Hebrew, which is what has not been done in the English version; forasmuch as there are therein not less than thirteen mistranslations.

The following, I believe, will be considered as a just representation of the original as it stands in the Hebrew Bible.

“Behold my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. As many as were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any other man, and his form more than the sons of man, (or Adam,) so shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him; for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider.\*

“Who hath believed what we heard? (or what was reported to us) and to whom was the arm of Jehovah revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground. He had no form nor comeliness; and when we saw him there was no beauty that we should desire him. He was despised and the outcast of men; a man of sorrows and familiar with grief;† and we hid as it were our faces from him, (or, as one that hid his face from us,) he was despised and esteemed not. Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried (away)

are successful, I shall no longer doubt that it *was* possible for the Devil Asmodus to have been corked up in a bottle by the *hard words of a conjurer*.

\* Or “*soliloquize upon*,” the original word in the Hebrew is used in this sense in Is. ch. xiv. 16.

† “Thou hast made us the offscouring and refuse in the midst of the peoples,” says Jer. Lam. ch. iii. 45.

our sorrows.\* Yet did we esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded through our transgressions, he was bruised through our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed, ("healing is to us," Hebr.) All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath caused to light (or "meet") upon him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he would not open his mouth; he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he would not open his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who would meditate [or consider sufficiently] his generation? [or who shall declare his generation.] For he was cut off out of the land of the living: through the transgression of my people was he smitten: ["smiting was to him," Hebr.] and he appointed his grave with the wicked, and with the rich† in his *deaths*.‡ Although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth, yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days,§ and the pleasure

\* The prophet here compares Israel to the scape goat, who had the sins of the people laid upon him, and was banished into the wilderness.

† Or "*fierce oppressor*." See Eichorn's Lex. in loc.

‡ "In *deaths* often" says Paul, meaning terrible dangers or sufferings.

§ Mr. Everett in his zeal to catch me at a fault with regard to this prophecy of Isaiah, has himself stumbled and fallen. I had maintained in my first work, in reference to this passage, that of the subject of this prophecy it is said, "He shall see his seed and shall prolong his days," and that therefore it could not relate to Jesus who had no posterity. Mr. Everett in his remarks upon this p. 147 of his work, *spiritualizes* the word "seed," and says it relates to the church, and he exclaims against me as follows, p.

In order to be enabled to give a fair interpretation of it, it is first of all necessary to give a fair translation of it from the original Hebrew, which is what has not been done in the English version; forasmuch as there are therein not less than thirteen mistranslations.

The following, I believe, will be considered as a just representation of the original as it stands in the Hebrew Bible.

“Behold my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. As many as were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any other man, and his form more than the sons of man, (or Adam,) so shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him; for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider.\*

“Who hath believed what we heard? (or what was reported to us) and to whom was the arm of Jehovah revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground. He had no form nor comeliness; and when we saw him there was no beauty that we should desire him. He was despised and the outcast of men; a man of sorrows and familiar with grief;† and we hid as it were our faces from him, (or, as one that hid his face from us,) he was despised and esteemed not. Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried (away)

are successful, I shall no longer doubt that it *was* possible for the Devil Asmodus to have been corked up in a bottle by the *hard words of a conjurer*.

\* Or “*soliloquize upon*,” the original word in the Hebrew is used in this sense in Is. ch. xiv. 16.

† “Thou hast made us the offscouring and refuse in the midst of the peoples,” says Jer. Lam. ch. iii. 45.



our sorrows.\* Yet did we esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded through our transgressions, he was bruised through our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed, ("healing is to us," Hebr.) All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath caused to light (or "meet") upon him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he would not open his mouth; he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he would not open his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who would meditate [or consider sufficiently] his generation? [or who shall declare his generation.] For he was cut off out of the land of the living: through the transgression of my people was he smitten: ["smiting was to him," Hebr.] and he appointed his grave with the wicked, and with the rich† in his *deaths*.‡ Although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth, yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days,§ and the pleasure

\* The prophet here compares Israel to the scape goat, who had the sins of the people laid upon him, and was banished into the wilderness.

† Or "*fierce oppressor*." See Eichorn's Lex. in loc.

‡ "In *deaths* often" says Paul, meaning terrible dangers or sufferings.

§ Mr. Everett in his zeal to catch me at a fault with regard to this prophecy of Isaiah, has himself stumbled and fallen. I had maintained in my first work, in reference to this passage, that of the subject of this prophecy it is said, "He shall see his seed and shall prolong his days," and that therefore it could not relate to Jesus who had no posterity. Mr. Everett in his remarks upon this p. 147 of his work, *spiritualizes* the word "seed," and says it relates to the church, and he exclaims against me as follows, p.

of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. He shall see [the fruit] of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant make many righteous, for he shall bear [away] their iniquities.\* Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great: and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he hath made naked his life unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." Is. from the 13th. v. of the 52d. ch. to the end of the 53d.

It is an acknowledged principle of sound criticism, that the same expressions in the same author, are to be understood always in the same sense, unless the context makes it plainly evident that another sense is intended. Let us, therefore, first of all, examine the chapters of Isaiah preceding the

147. "What *indolent carelessness* it is to say that the word seed, shall not be spiritualized here, when the very next verse says, he shall see the TRAVAIL of his SOUL." "What poor mortals we are," says Sir Hugh! If Mr. Everett will look at the Hebrew, he will find that the "indolent carelessness" he speaks of, was not mine but his; for the Hebrew word translated *travail*, has no reference whatever to childbearing, but signifies *fearful toil*, or *painful distress*. The English word *travail*, in the time of the translators of the Bible had this signification. They have employed it in this signification in the passages following: "And Moses told his father-in-law all that the Lord had done unto Pharaoh and to the Egyptians for Israel's sake, and all the *travail* that had come upon them by the way." Ex. ch. xviii. 8. Again, "this sore *travail* hath God given to the sons of men to be exercised therewith." Eccles. i. 13. As Mr. Everett says, p. 114 of his work, "It is good to be positive but better to be correct; and the reader I doubt not will agree with me, that such dogmatical blundering as this is prevented from being offensive only as it is ludicrous."

\* The prophet represents here, that Israel should be to the nations what Aaron was to the Jews. Aaron was considered as bearing away the sins of the Jews on the day of atonement. "Ye shall be named the priests of Jehovah, and men shall call you the ministers of our God." Is. ch. lxi. 6.

extract, in order to understand who he means by "God's servant."

In the 49th. of Isaiah, v. 3. it is said, "Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified." In ch. xlviii. 20. "The Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob." In ch. xlv. 4. "For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect." In ch. xlv. 1. "Yet hear now, O Jacob my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen: fear not O Jacob, my servant." v. 2. "Remember these O Jacob and Israel, for thou art my servant. I have formed thee, thou art my servant O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me." v. 21.

"Ye are my witnesses saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen." ch. xliii. 10. See also the whole of ch. xlii. "Thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend." ch. xli. 8.

There can be no doubt therefore, that by "my servant," mentioned in the first part of the prophecy quoted from Isaiah, and by "my righteous servant," in the latter part of it, that "God's servant Israel" must be understood to be meant, provided there be nothing in the context to make it necessary to resort to some other interpretation. Mr. Everett says that there is something in the context, which forbids the application of this prophecy to "God's servant Israel." Let us then examine the reasons on which this assertion is founded.

He says 1st, p. 136 of his work, that the subject of this prophecy is spoken of as "passive and unresisting;" and he exclaims, "The Jews passive and unresisting!" They are the most obstinate and unyielding of the tribes of the earth, and have resisted the arm of power, and the lapse of time, which have crushed all other nations into oblivion,"



The prophecy speaks of their non-resistance to *oppression*, and Mr. Everett tells us, to contradict this, that "they have resisted the arm of power, and the lapse of time, which have crushed all other nations into oblivion." This seems to me to be irrelevant.

"They 'afflicted and complained not!' their complaints have been fiercer than their sufferings have been cruel." Is this true? Does Mr. Everett really believe it to be true? Does not all the world know it to be false?\*

"They have done no iniquity?" When no iniquity? Not in the days of Isaiah their own prophet, who cries, "Ah! sinful nation, people laden with iniquity, seed of evil doers." Not in the days of Josephus their own historian, who sets forth scenes of depravity which turn common wickedness into virtue, and declares "that the earth would have swallowed them, if the Romans had not swept them from its face?" No iniquity in the ages since, throughout the cities of the dispersion, where they are proverbially dishonest, and professedly unfaithful." &c. &c.

Now all this eloquent invective can be set aside so far as it affects my application of this prophecy by this simple remark; that this prophecy neither relates to the *wicked* Jews of the time of Isaiah, nor of Josephus, nor the ages since, but refers to "*God's servant Israel*," i. e. not to the rebellious and reprobate of the Jewish nation, but to those of the house

\* Have their complaints been "fiercer" than the flames of the piles of Madrid, Lisbon, Paris, Italy, Germany, and England, in which thousands of them have been burnt to ashes? For shame! Mr. Everett. The recording angel may drop a tear upon what you have written, not to blot it out, but in compassion for the miseries for which you seem to think words of "complaint" are an equivalent.

of Jacob, who have, who do, and who shall adhere to God's law, and obey his commandments ; for no others of them will God acknowledge as " his servants."\*

I would also observe, that the stress which Mr. Everett lays upon the phrase " no iniquity," shows either great carelessness, or great ignorance of the idiom of the Hebrew Scriptures ; because every man, familiar with those writings, knows that this expression is one of those called Hebreisms, which must be understood in a restrained sense. In proof of which, and a decisive one too, I would refer him to the prophecy of Balaam, recorded, Num. ch. xxii. 21. where Balaam exclaims *in his prophetic enthusiasm*, " He [i. e. God.] *hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel.*"

Now I suppose that the 53d. of Isaiah, is a representation of what may be the reflections of the nations, who have despised and persecuted " God's servant Israel," through the influence of the prejudices of their mistaken religion, but who had become sensible of their error by seeing the tremendous interference of God himself in their behalf, predicted over and over again by the prophets as to hap-

\* Mr. Everett, after having poured forth what is quoted above, very consistently adds in a note to p. 137, " I cheerfully agree with one of the most active benefactors of the Jewish nation, who while he acknowledges these facts, charges the blame of them to the Christians." Very true, and truly I do not know, what right one man has to trample another into the mire, and then abuse him for being dirty. Mr. Everett remarks upon the same subject, p. 210, " Bowed down with universal scorn, they have been called secret and sullen ; cut off from pity and charity, they have been thought selfish and unfeeling, and are summoned to believe on the Prince of Peace by ministers clothed with terror and death." What an unconscious comment from the pen of a Christian on the words of the prophet. " He was despised and the outcast of men, a man of sorrows, and familiar with suffering, and we hid as it were our faces from him ; he was despised and we esteemed him not."

pen. The natural consequence of this conviction in the minds of those nations, would be a *revulsion* of the feelings to the *opposite extreme*. They would exaggerate the merits, and extenuate the demerits of "God's servant." They would reflect with astonishment and commiseration on their past sufferings. "We considered them," they might exclaim, "as a God-abandoned race, and devoted to wretchedness by him for having crucified their king. But instead of being the victims of God's wrath, they were wounded through our cruelty, they were bruised through our iniquitous treatment. It is we who have sinned more than they. We having gone astray in our ignorance, being without the knowledge of God and his law. How passive and unresisting were they! they were oppressed, they were afflicted, and complained not: when through false accusations and mistaken cruelty, they were plundered and condemned to die, they went like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before the shearer is dumb, so they opened not their mouth. They were taken from the dungeon to be slain; they were wantonly massacred, and every man was their foe; and the cause of the sufferers who condescended to examine? *They had done no iniquity to merit this*: for their adherence to their faith, which we charged upon them as a crime, we now see to be approved of by their God, as an acceptable instance of unexampled perseverance in the cause of truth."\*

\* I have had the satisfaction to find, since my return to America, that the distinguished Christian Hebræist, Rosenmüller, in his notes on the Old Testament, maintains as I do, that the 53d. of Isaiah refers not to Christ, but to the Hebrew nation, of which the following extract from the work referred to may serve as proof. "In tot. V. T. locis Messias tam variis modis describatur, tamen ne unicum quidem vestigium deprehenditur unde collegere jure posset existimasse veteres Hæbreos Messiam quem expectabant *talia esse perpessurum quæ ministerium divinum hac pericopa, [Is. 53.] descriptum perpessum esse legimus. Ubicunque vel in Psalmis vel in prophetarum libris de Messia agitur semper nobis*



Mr. Everett proceeds, p. 145, "If any thing needs be added, the following observation is *important*, viz. that there is one passage so clearly inapplicable to the Jewish nation, and so totally incongruous with the rest of the interpretation, that Mr. English *passes it over without even the attempt of an explanation*. It is this: in a part of the prophecy which he puts into the mouth of the *Gentiles* we read, "for [the Hebrew I must remind Mr. Everett reads "by or through,"] the transgressions of MY PEOPLE was he stricken." This Mr. English paraphrases "for [it should have been "by or through"] the thoughtless crimes of my people he suffered. But what the Gentiles could mean by "MY PEOPLE" he does not say, and this difficulty is *fatal* to the whole interpretation."

I will presently show Mr. Everett, that this formidable objection, so emphatically announced, is after all a mere man in buckram: and I am almost sorry that in doing this, I shall be obliged to expose one more proof of Mr. Everett's having neglected the study of "the beggarly elements," in order to devote himself, without distraction, to the understanding of the delectable types and allegories of the New Testament. Mr. Everett certainly is a scholar and a man of talents, but he does not perfectly know, nor will understand, the contents of the Old Testament; and the above objection is a proof of it.

He maintains, that the expression "my people," could not be used by a Gentile; and that therefore my whole interpretation of the prophecy in Isaiah, is fatally affected by his objection.—I request Mr. Everett to have the goodness to turn to the book of Ruth ch i. 16., where he will find this *Gentile*,

proponitur imago potentissimi regis, felicissimi herois, gloriosissimi reipublicæ statoris, coloribus ab imperii Davidici aut Salomonei flore, regumque orientalium pompa sumptis depicta." Rosenmüller's notes on the 53d. of Isaiah.

“this Moabitish damsel” saying to her mother-in-law “thy people shall be *my people*”. Will Mr. Everett look a little farther to the 1 Sam. ch. v. 10. in the Hebrew, (not in a translation,) where he will find the *Gentile Philistines* saying, “They have brought about the ark of the God of Israel to slay me and *my people*.” (ac. to the Hebr.) again, v. 11. “Send away the ark of the God of Israel, and let it go to his own place, that it slay me not and *my people*.” (ac. to the Hebr.)\*

Mr. Everett, therefore, may understand from these examples, why I passed over this phrase “without even the attempt of an explanation;” because, truly, I never dreamed that this formidable objection would have been made: or that any man would write upon the Jewish controversy, who did not first inform himself of the contents and phraseology of the Hebrew Bible.

Having, as I believe, shewn that the 53d. chapter of Isaiah *can* be understood of “God’s servant Israel,” I will now attempt to shew the reasons why I think that it *cannot* relate to Jesus of Nazareth.

1st. Of the subject of this prophecy it is said v. 9. “and he appointed his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his *deaths*,” in the plural. Now of Jesus we read in the gospels the direct contrary: for the gospels represent that his *death* was with the wicked, and his *grave* with the rich.†

2. The use of the word *deaths*, in the plural, appears to me to necessitate the application of the prophecy to a *people*, not to an individual. The same

\* “Thou hast put forth a riddle unto the children of *my people*.” says Sampson’s Philistine wife to him, Judges ch. xiv. 16.

† I had made the same objection in my first publication. Mr. Everett, in his elaborate view of my arguments upon the 53d. of Isaiah, has not thought proper to notice this objection: *possibly* he thought it a trivial one.

is evident distinctly from the Hebrew of v. 8. at the end of the verse, in the word "*lamoo*."

3. The subject of this prophecy is said to have been "oppressed", i. e. by pecuniary exactions : for that is the *radical idea* of the Hebrew word, as is shown and asserted in the lexicons of the Hebrew language.\* This is peculiarly true of the Jewish nation, but was not true at all with regard to Jesus.

And to conclude, this prophecy is quoted repeatedly in the New Testament. Now, that none of the quotations in the New Testament from the Old can be maintained as prophecies fulfilled by Jesus, is the opinion of the learned Christians Michaelis, Eichorn, Semler, Eckerman, Lessing, &c. as is allowed by Mr. Everett : of course the 53d ch. of Isaiah in their opinions cannot be adduced as a prophetic proof of Christianity : and Mr. Everett, in maintaining the contrary, has to struggle not only against argument, but the strongest Christian authority that can be produced on any question of Biblical Criticism.

Mr. Everett, in several passages of his book, has thought proper to charge me with errors ; but in the course of his discussion of my interpretation of the 53d. of Isaiah, has directly accused me of *falsehood*, and of *fraud*, p. 148. of his work.

With regard to many of these errors, the situation and circumstances I am in at present, put it out of my power to defend myself, because I cannot get the books he refers to in order to test his statements ; †

\* Buxtorf's remark upon the very word in Is. 53. ch. is "arctatus, coarctatus, pressus, oppressus fuit, *propria exactionibus*." Buxtorf's Heb. Lex. Mr. Everett p. 146 of his work says, that Robertson declares that the radical idea of the word which Mr. English insists upon rendering 'he was oppressed by pecuniary exactions', to be "fearful distress." To this I answer, that Robertson was a christian and had a reason for saying so.

† The only works I have had to aid me in the composition of this book, are Mr. Everett's work, a Hebrew Bible, and Lexicon, and the English Bible. I have not been able to procure any thing beyond this in Egypt, and think myself fortunate in having so much.



but of the latter imputations, the work of Mr. Everett itself not only enables me to justify myself, but to *fix those charges upon him*.

He says in the 148 page of his work, remarking upon my assertion in "The Grounds of Christianity Examined."—"In a word the literal application of this prophecy [the 53d. of Isaiah] to Jesus is now given up by the most learned Hebrew scholars, who allow that the literal sense of the original can never be understood of him."—Why does not Mr. English name these Hebrew scholars? *Simply because his assertion is not true.*" Indeed! Does not Mr. Everett himself say in the 247 p. of his work, that Eichorn in a view of a work of Dr. Ekerman says, that "the principle of accommodation, which the *better interpreters* had already applied to many violations in the New Testament, is by this author extended to all." "Though this opinion of Dr. Ekerman," says Mr. Everett, must be allowed to savour a little of the extravagance of theory, *Eichorn* adopts it. As the work alluded to, the "Theological Contributions" has become a classical book with one class of the German divines, who are *thought to excel* in critical learning, *there is no doubt* that this doctrine is *generally received among them*. MICHAELIS we all know *admits it*; and Marsh is the only famous critic of the present day who does not embrace it."

Now the 53d. ch. of Isaiah is quoted in the New Testament, \* of course, therefore, according to Mr. Everett's own representations of the opinions of these learned critics, they must deny that the prophecy of Isaiah has any reference to Jesus, and hold that it is quoted merely by way of accommodation. And if so how has Mr. Everett dared to accuse me of

\* Gospel ac. to John. xii. 38. Rom. x. 16. Acts viii. 32. 33.

*falsehood* in representing, that “the literal application of this prophecy to Jesus is now given up by the most learned Hebrew scholars, who allow that the literal sense of the original can never be understood of him”?! There is undoubtedly a falsehood told in this affair, and a conscious suppression of truth, but it is not I who tell the first, or conceal the latter.

Mr. Everett then proceeds. “Priestley and Grotius are all he claims, [the reader may see by the above that I might have claimed more,] Priestley was a learned man, but he has no pretensions as a Hebrew scholar, and though Mr. English quotes Grotius, he does it incorrectly. He declares that “Grotius has applied it to Jeremiah, and says, that Jesus Christ has nothing to do with it except in a secondary sense, but that the whole of it *from beginning to end* refers to Jeremiah.” “There are but few to whom I need say” continues Mr. Everett, “that the words of Grotius in his commentary are, “These marks have their first fulfilment in Jeremiah, but a more *especial, sublime, and often* indeed more *literal* fulfilment in Christ.” Mr. Everett’s work p. 148. I do not see how this passage of Grotius contradicts my representation of his opinion. The passage from Grotius quoted by Mr. Everett declares, “that these marks [i. e. the 53d. of Isaiah] have their first fulfillment in Jeremiah;” of course they could not be fulfilled by any other except in a *secondary* sense, as I have asserted. As for the “more especial, sublime, and often indeed more literal fulfilment in Christ,” I have always supposed that this and similar expressions in other parts of Grotius’ Commentary, were understood, by all who were acquainted with Grotius’ history and the times in which he wrote, to be intended for a mere *salvo*, as a tub thrown out to that great whale the vulgar; to contradict *directly* whose opinions with regard to

the prophecies, was in the time of Grotius very dangerous, as he himself, notwithstanding all his precaution and truckling, seriously experienced.\*

“Also, [Mr. Everett goes on to say,] in adducing the authority of Priestley for his interpretation without reference or qualification, Mr. English gives cause to think, that he did not know, or knowing forbore to state, that Priestley pronounces it impossible, in one of his works, to explain this prophecy of any but Jesus Christ. What Hebrew scholars are to be named with Lowth and MICHAELIS, who both assert the *literal* application to Christ! Mr. English may one day learn, that asseverations like these whatever immediate effect they produce, will finally stand in the way of his character for veracity.” p. 149.

This has been to me the most irritating passage in Mr. Everett’s book, because it is a tissue of im-

\* That Grotius would sometimes prevaricate to serve a turn is certain. There is an anecdote on record, contained in the notes to Gibbon’s account of Mohammed in his Roman History, which proves this. In Grotius’ famous book on the truth of the Christian Religion, there is a story that Mohammed had a tame pidgeon, which, he taught to come and peck in his ear, in order to make his followers believe that the bird was the organ by whom he received revelations from God. This story is not believed, nor was ever heard of among the Musselmen. On the publication of Grotius’ Book, a friend learned in Oriental Literature, came to him and asked him for his authority for this story, Grotius frankly owned that he had none, in other words that the story was a *pious fraud* in order to stigmatize Mohammedanism. “This story” Gibbon says, “was accordingly *left out* of the *Arabic* version of Grotius’ Book, intended to circulate among the Musselmen, for fear that they should laugh at such a piece of ignorance or effrontery: but it still *maintains* an edifying place in those copies printed for the perusal of Christians.”! I quote from memory.

It is really a pity that the Protestant Church, which like a Magdalen professes to repent of her errors committed during her former connection with “the mother of abominations,” should yet retain so many of the bad habits contracted during their past intimacy. Some folks have even pretended to have observed, that notwithstanding their old quarrel, they seem to have recommenced a “nodding acquaintance.” I hope the report is untrue.



puident ignorance or impudent fraud, and as such I will prove it.\*

I have always supposed, that in quoting the opinion of an author as authority, it is the fairest way to quote his *last avowed* opinions. Now the work of Priestley's, which I refer to as applying the prophecy of Isaiah to the Jewish nation, as I do, is entitled "Priestley's Notes on Scripture," and was published after his arrival in America, several years AFTER the work to which Mr. Everett refers, wherein Priestley, maintained that it was impossible to explain this prophecy of any but Jesus Christ." Therefore this fact "gives cause to think, that Mr. Everett did not know, or knowing forbore to state (which I believe in my conscience is the truth) *this circumstance*," which completely acquits *me* at least of a *suppressio veri*.†

\* Mr. Everett will probably say, that he made these deadly stabs at my character upon the same principle that the New England Cobbler killed the Indian Hogan Mogan.

"Not out of *malice*, but mere *zeal* :

Because he was an infidel."

† I have a right to believe so, for Mr. Everett quotes Priestley's notes, p. 339 of his work. Dr. Priestley united in his character, the rare concurrence of a keen controversial writer, with great fairness and candour. He seems always to have been willingly disposed to resign an untenable opinion, when convinced by the arguments of his opponent. His conduct in regard to the question between the Jews and Christians, may be considered as a proof of this. He wrote letters to the Jews in defence of Christianity, which were replied to by Levi. In this controversy Levi had evidently the better of Priestley. Priestley seems to have been sensible of this, which occasioned him to examine the question more minutely. The result of his examination led him to avow, in a Dissertation in the Theological Repository published in England, I believe in the very one which Mr. Everett refers to [Theol. Rep. vol. 5.] that the prophets clearly justify the Jews for expecting as their Messiah, a glorious monarch of the house and *name* of David, who should reign over them and all the human race ; but he also maintained as I think in the same Dissertation, that Jesus Christ is nevertheless predicted by the 53d. of Isaiah. Several years afterwards, when Priestley resided in America, he published his notes on Scripture, wherein he *abandons* the Christian interpretation of the 53d. of Isaiah, and applies it as I do to the Jewish nation.

"What Hebrew scholars are to be named with Lowth and Michaelis!" Several—among whom Eichorn stands pre-eminent. Moreover, how has it happened that "the keen detector of dissonances" has contradicted himself in quoting Michaelis? Here, because he chooses to cling to the 53d. of Isaiah as favouring his cause, he quotes the name of MICHAELIS as asserting "its *literal application* to Christ." In another place, (p. 247.) where it is necessary to defend the New Testament from the charge of false application of the prophecies of the Old Testament to Jesus, he quotes again the great name of MICHAELIS as the *patron* of the system of accommodation, which system maintains that the 53d. of Isaiah has no application to Christ at all! but is quoted by the writers of the New Testament merely by way of allusion. Mr. Everett himself may live to learn, that such double dealing attempts to slander his opponent, and impose upon his readers, "whatever immediate effect they may produce, will finally stand in the way of *his* character for veracity," or at least for fairness and candour.

These are not the only instances in which Mr. Everett has calumniated me, and abused the good nature of his readers. For example—

I had maintained in my first work, that the gospel called of Matthew was a forgery, and not a translation from the ancient Hebrew gospel of Matthew, and had supported my opinion by saying, that learned Christians allowed that "it had not the air of a translation." This Mr. Everett contradicts as follows: "But Mr. English is aware that MICHAELIS, the highest authority on these subjects, pronounces that *it is* a translation, and maintains his proposition not less from the unanimous testimony of the ancients than from internal evidence." p. 472 of Mr. Everett's work.

I beg the reader after reading this to attend care-



fully to what is said by Mr. Everett in p. 464. "Semler's opinion of the origin and composition of the *three first* gospels, was the *same* as that of Le Clerc, MICHAELIS, Lessing, and Eichorn, and which has been illustrated and maintained by professor Marsh. This opinion is that they were *compiled* from *documents* [not one document or gospel, but several] of our Lord's preaching and life, which had been committed to writing during his life, or immediately after, and which became after different *additions*, revisions and translations, the BASIS of our present gospels." Here the reader sees that when it is necessary to oppose my statements, in one place Mr. Everett avers that Michaelis maintained that the Greek gospel according to Matthew, was a translation of Matthew's Hebrew; in another place, where it is also necessary to oppose me, he avers that Michaelis believed that the gospel according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke were *compiled* compositions, and of course none of them were translations from any one work. "I would, says Mr. Everett, answer Mr. English *fairly*, or not at all." If this and the other instances quoted be specimens of Mr. Everett's *fairness*, what would be his conduct upon the very impossible supposition that he could be guilty of duplicity?

2. Mr. Everett tells his readers, that the Jewish Rabbies "are the most contemptible critics that have appeared;" that "they are so silly that he is almost ashamed to quote them;" that they were in short idiots. If so, of what value can their opinions be on controverted points, which must after all be settled by reason and scripture, and not by any bare human authority.\* Nevertheless Mr. Everett

\* If all that Mr. Everett has said upon this subject were true, it would amount after all only to an *argument ad prejudicium*, for the Jews of past times, who believed the dreams of the Rabbies, but is of no weight whatever with those who reject them, as do all the Biblical critics of the present day.



is continually calling upon his reader to believe his arguments and statements upon the authority of these said Rabbies. If I were one of his Christian readers, I should consider myself *insulted* by such a procedure. It is almost tantamount to saying, "it is true, my arguments are built upon the authority of fools, but yet they may serve to convince you."

3. I had accused the writers of the New Testament in my first publication, of having blundered in applying passages of the Old Testament as prophecies of Jesus Christ. Mr. Everett justifies them by maintaining in the 5th. chapter of his work, that it is true that these quotations cannot be supported as prophecies, but that they are *excusable* for the following reasons. The writers of the New Testament were Jews; the Jews of their times believed that every text of Scripture had seventy-two faces, and that each one regarded the Messiah, and that the resurrection of the dead was also taught in every chapter of Scripture, though we might not be able to perceive it, and that the writers of the New Testament had been brought up in these silly prejudices, and therefore argued on these principles, i. e. that, notwithstanding their being inspired men and full of the spirit of the Almighty, they continued *in this respect* as silly as ever.

Now if there be a pious and sincere Christian in the world, and should have this hypothesis laid before him for his acceptance as the *best means* of defending the writers of the New Testament, from the charge of fraud or blundering in their application of the prophecies, I venture to say that that pious and sincere Christian would, without hesitation, believe the proposer of such an hypothesis to be ruining the cause he professed to defend. "What! he might say, are the quotations in the New Testament from the Old, indeed founded on folly, and

alleged through stupidity? Have the writers of the New Testament, who are allowed to have been inspired by the Most High God with a perfect knowledge and understanding of the Christian religion, who are representing continually that Jesus Christ *was* foretold by the prophets, and that their own minds were opened by the Holy Ghost to understand the Scriptures, have they indeed though continually quoting the Old Testament, after all *never* quoted for us even *one* of the predictions on which they say their religion is founded? and have they spent all the time they devoted to writing for the salvation of the souls of men, in *fooling* with the Old Testament in the manner you aver? 'Tis false! 'Tis monstrous! Either your hypothesis is a fable, or Christianity itself is like the dreams of the Rabbies."\*

\* There occurs to me an instance of carelessness or something worse on the part of Mr. Everett in p. 342 of his work. I had said in my first publication, that "there is in the speech of James, Acts xv. a quotation from Amos in which, to make it fit the subject, (which after all it does not fit) is the substitution of the words "the remnant of *men*," for "the remnant of *Edom*," as it is in the original." On this Mr. Everett remarks with astonishing composure, "There are few of my readers to whom I need say, that the same Hebrew word means 'men,' and 'Edom,' according as it is pronounced, and St. James has as fair a right to pronounce it 'men,' as Mr. English has to pronounce it 'Edom.'" The only way by which Mr. Everett can escape the charge of fraud in this affair, is by allowing that he did not take the trouble to look at the passage quoted from Amos, ix. 12. in the Hebrew Bible, from which it will appear that neither St. James, nor any other Saint, has a right to read the passage "the remnant of *men*" (or Adam;) because the Hebrew word contains a letter (*vau*;) which the word *Adam* does not contain, and which limits its signification to *Edom*.

I would observe by the way, that the passage in Amos "that they, (i. e. Israel,) may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen (or nations) *which are called by my name*, appears to contain an allusion to the Christians and Mohammedans, who are the only nations beside the Jews who invoke the name of Jehovah, and profess faith in his prophets. There are not a few passages in the prophets, which have a significance at present, which they could not have had at the time the predictions were uttered.



When I see such principles, and other like principles avowed in Mr. Everett's work, I feel myself authorized to propose to him the following questions, by which I hope he will not consider himself as put to the torture.

What, Mr. Everett, were your motives for quitting, so abruptly and unexpectedly, the most respectable society who had done you the honour to elect you their pastor, believing you to be the only man worthy to succeed the learned, eloquent and lamented Buckminster? This abandonment of your station took place after you had engaged yourself in the examination of the question between me, Mr. Cary, and Mr. Channing. If you felt doubts of the validity of the Christian religion, and were therefore scrupulous about going into your pulpit every Sunday to preach Christianity in the name of the God of Truth, and therefore resigned your post, your conduct thus far does you honour and not shame. But if, after this, you have allowed yourself to be overcome by the solicitations of interested friends (who might have been anxious that you should publish something, that would allay the suspicions and silence the rumours your conduct had occasioned) to give to the world your very singular book, you have *acted a part* unjust towards me, and injurious to yourself, for you now see the consequence. You are taken in the snare you had laid for me, and your violent dealing has come down on your own head.

I come now to the examination of the celebrated prophecy of the seventy weeks. This prophecy has always run the crux Criticorum. It is unquestionably a very ambiguous one, since Mr. Everett himself informs us in a note, p. 167 of his work, that "Calovius whose day has passed a century ago, in a dissertation upon the mysteries of the seventy weeks, numbers *twenty-five* different Christian hy-



potheses," to which may be added at least two more, those of Michaelis and Blayney.

If so, I would ask what stress a reasonable man can lay upon a simple prophecy which is allowedly so ambiguous, as to have led Christians, sincerely disposed to make a prophecy of Jesus Christ out of this passage, to interpret it at least twenty-seven different ways?

There appears to me to be a mistranslation at the root of the prophecy, which vitiates and confounds all the systems of interpretation applied to it that I know of. I conceive that the prophecy should be translated thus.

"*Seventy times seven*\* are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal [up] the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy things."

"Know therefore, and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore, and to build Jerusalem, unto the anointed Prince, shall be

\* In the beginning of the 9th. ch. of Daniel, the prophet says, "I Daniel, understood by books the number of years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish *seventy years* in the desolations of Jerusalem. And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications with fasting, sackcloth and ashes." It appears from his prayer, that he supposed the Babylonish captivity of seventy years, would terminate the chastisement of his nation. Upon which the angel Gabriel was sent to "give him skill and understanding," and to inform him, that their chastisement would not be terminated by the captivity of *seventy years*, but by one of "seventy times seven," i. e. a long and undefined period. The words "seven," and "seventy," were frequently used by the Hebrews to signify an indefinite number, and "seventy times seven" is a Hebræism used to signify a *great* and indefinite number. Thus one of the disciples of Jesus is represented as asking him, "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him; until seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times, but until seventy times seven." Mat. ch. xviii. 21, 22.

seven weeks ; and [in]\* threescore and two weeks the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.”†

“ And after threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and have no successor ; and the people of the Prince that shall come, shall destroy the city, and the sanctuary : and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end desolations are determined.”

“ And he shall confirm a covenant with many for one week, and in the midst of the [or, a] week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease ; and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined be poured upon the desolate.” Dan. ch. ix. 24, 27.

Whatever may be the true signification of this prophecy, it is not, I conceive, favourable to the purpose to which Mr. Everett applies it, for the following reasons. 1. That in supposing what is commonly translated “seventy weeks,” to signify four hundred and ninety years, the prophecy would be *falsified* ; for certainly the expiration of this period did not “finish transgression,” nor “make an end

\* In my first work I had alleged this prophecy of Daniel, and had *inserted* this word “in” enclosed in a parenthesis, in order to signify, that it was not in the original, but was suggested by it as necessary to the sense of the original. This “in,” in a parenthesis, the zealous Mr. Everett, who loves to find fault, pronounces to be “an absolute interpolation,” “and a shameless, one too.” p. 157 of his work.

† The reader will see that I suppose the original to make one period of seven weeks, and one of sixty-two. “The English translation renders it “seven weeks and threescore and two weeks,” making one period of the two. This appears to me to be inadmissible : because if the prophet meant to signify but one period, he would, as I think, have said, according to the analogy of the Hebrew language, not “seven weeks, *and* threescore and two weeks,” but “nine weeks and threescore weeks.” In the Hebrew the clauses of the seven weeks, and sixty and two weeks, are separated by a character which frequently, in the Hebrew Bible, performs the function of a *full stop*.

of sins," nor "make reconciliation for iniquity," nor "bring in everlasting righteous," nor "anoint the most holy things," i. e. as I understand it, the new and eternal temple and its altar, predicted by Ezekiel in the last chapters of his prophecies. On the contrary, the Jews became *more wicked than ever*, and the temple then standing was *destroyed to its foundations*.

2. It follows from what is allowed by Mr. Everett himself, p. 139 of his work, that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem, to the birth of Jesus Christ, was *not* seven weeks and sixty and two weeks, i. e. sixty-nine weeks, but EIGHTY-FOUR weeks. For he says there, that the duration of the second temple was "NINETY-FOUR weeks," i. e. six hundred and fifty-nine years. Now if my memory does not deceive me, Jerusalem was taken and the temple destroyed by Titus about the year *seventy* after the birth of Christ, which is equal to ten prophetic weeks; therefore take ten weeks from the ninety-four weeks, (the time Mr. Everett states to have elapsed from the building of the second temple, to its destruction) and there remains EIGHTY-FOUR weeks, and not SIXTY-NINE. Which circumstance, appears to me to vitiate entirely the interpretation of Mr. Everett, who supposes the anointed one," spoken of as to be cut off after the sixty-nine weeks, to be Jesus Christ.

As to who the "anointed ones" were, the first I think entirely refers to Cyrus, and the last who was to be "cut off" and have no successor, may either mean the pious and good Onias mentioned in the book of Maccabees, who was the last I think of the legitimate Jewish High Priests, [for after his time History testifies that several, who had not the right of primogeniture as descendants of Aaron, obtained the priesthood by force, by intrigue, and by bribery;] or the last Jewish High Priest, Joshua



who perished during the siege of Jerusalem, according to Josephus. At any rate the anointed one who was to be cut off, cannot mean Jesus of Nazareth; because this anointed one was to be cut off in that same week of seven years, in which the city was destroyed, whereas Jesus was crucified *forty years before* that event; a circumstance I insist which excludes any application of this prophecy to Jesus.

The claims set up for Jesus of Nazareth are moreover evidently rejected by Daniel's prophecy, even according to Mr. Everett's interpretation, forasmuch as he did *not* appear at the expiration of sixty-nine weeks, but of EIGHTY-FOUR.

And to conclude this discussion, I would observe that Daniel, ch. iii. in his account of the image [seen in a vision by Nebuchadnezzar] whose head was of gold, breast and arms of silver, belly of brass, legs of iron, and feet and toes of iron and clay, is predicting the empires which have most influenced the fate of the Hebrew nation; i. e. the Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman, the last represented by "the iron legs," which did indeed bestride the world; these "iron legs" are represented as terminating in feet and toes part of iron and part of clay, which have no natural coherence; i. e. the Roman empire shall be divided into several kingdoms, partly strong and partly weak: a prophecy remarkably fulfilled in the history and condition of the kingdoms of Europe. The prophet goes on to say in ch. ii. that in the latter days of those kings or kingdoms, [*which are yet subsisting*] "the God of Heaven would set up a kingdom which should never be destroyed," that of the Messiah. Of course the kingdom of the Messiah was not to be—not only not till *after* the destruction of the Roman empire—but not till the *latter days of the kingdoms which grew up out of the ruins*; whereas Jesus Christ was born in the time of Augustus, i. e. when *the Roman em...*

*pire itself* was in the height of its splendour and vigour. Mr. Everett in p. 201, endeavours to escape the strong gripe of the prophet Daniel, by maintaining that these strong and weak parts, into which the Roman empire was to be divided, meant that it should be divided into "*strong and weak institutions*." Now to turn this sensible interpretation head over heels, it appears to me to be only necessary to observe, that these "strong and weak parts" into which the Roman empire was to be divided, were, according to the prophet, ch. ii. 43. of Daniel, to "mingle themselves with the seed of men," i. e. make intermarriages; which, it appears to me to be a thing that "*strong and weak institutions*" cannot do. This, however has remarkably been the case among the royal families of Europe, who intermarry too with the avowed design of cementing union and promoting peace and harmony. Nevertheless, agreeable to the prophet's prediction, they have *not* "cleaved together, but on the contrary have been almost constantly at war with each other.

## PEBBLE IV.

“The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim ; afterwards shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days.” Hos. iii. 4, 5.

“I will set up one shepherd over them, even my servant David, he shall feed [or govern] them, and he shall be their shepherd : and I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David, a prince among them.” Ezech, ch. xxxiv. 23.


“David my servant shall be king over them, and there shall be one shepherd,”——“my servant David shall be their Prince for ever.” Ezek. ch. xxxvii. 24, 25.

“They shall serve Jehovah their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto [or for] them.” Jer. xxx. 9.

“Incline your ear and come unto me : hear and your soul shall live ; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Behold I have given *him* for a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander to the peoples.” Is. lv. 3, 4.

From such passages I inferred, in my first publication, that the name of the true Messiah, was to be DAVID, and not Jesus. To avoid the force of these passages Mr. Everett has recourse to allegory and analogy.



Jesus is prophesied of in these passages, says he, by the name of **DAVID**, because “there was an *analogy* between these two distinguished servants of God. David, from a low and humble estate, was raised to be the founder of the *temporal* glories of his kingdom; and Christ, not less humble in his origin, was the author of the *spiritual* distinction of Israel; David was the most illustrious *political*, and Christ the most distinguished *moral* instrument of the Lord. David was commanded to entrust to his successor the erection of the *famous temple*, which was the centre of the Jewish worship; and Christ has founded through the agency of his apostles that  **CHURCH**,!! by which his religion has been preserved, and diffused in the world.”

“To laugh, were want of dignity, or grace,  
“And to be grave exceeds all power of face.”

I assure Mr. Everett, that the days of **TYPE** and **FIGURE** are gone by, and have been succeeded among Biblical Critics “by a stricter style of reasoning,” and are now considered as “pious whims.”\*

In the present advanced state of sacred Criticism even the beautiful allegory in Paul’s Epistle to the Gal. ch. iv. which makes Hagar, Abraham’s maid, nothing less than “Mount Sinai in Arabia;” and Sarah, Abraham’s wife, to be the “Jerusalem, that is

\* Mr. Everett appears himself to have been somewhat embarrassed by the gravity he is obliged to maintain in holding forth this antithetical “*analogy*.” For he says, that he forbears “to pursue analogies like these, which though they abound in the writings of the Old Testament, [I challenge him to point out a single such instance] and are familiar to all the nations of the East, have long been succeeded among us by a stricter style of reasoning” p. 178. They have indeed been long since exploded by the Modern Biblical Critics: and I doubt not that if this curious analogy should ever be subject to the notice of Eichorn or Lessing, they would in their closets peruse it “with a smile or a sigh.”

above the mother of us all!" has come to be regarded as "rather queer."

I had also objected that the coming of the true Messiah, was according to the Old Testament, to be preceded by the appearance of Elijah the prophet on earth; and that he had not appeared before the æra of Jesus, nor ever since.

In answer to this, Mr. Everett endeavours to show p. 172. & seq., that a man named John the Baptist—a righteous person,—whose raiment was of camels hair,—and whose meat was locusts and wild honey, who lived in the age of Jesus of Nazareth, was Elijah, and had a right to be so considered—by a *figure*.

To this I answer, that the prophecy of Malachi does not say "Behold I will send you one *like* Elijah, or "an Elijah,"—but it says explicitly, and expressly, "Behold I will send you *Elijah the Prophet*, before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord; and he shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children; and the hearts of the children to their fathers." Mal. iv. 5, 6.

Now who is "Elijah the Prophet?" undoubtedly the great prophet of Israel, who called down fire from heaven—who raised the dead to life—and who ascended alive to heaven in a chariot of fire; God by such a translation sufficiently intimating that he had in reserve for him, *some extraordinary commission*. Moreover the coming of this Elijah the prophet, was to be followed by "the great and terrible day of Jehovah," by which name the prophets call the personal descent of Jehovah upon the earth, to take vengeance on the wicked, and to punish the oppressors and persecutors of his people.\* Was the ap-

\* "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?—I that speak in righteousness mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy gar-

pearing of John the Baptist followed by this event ? or has it yet occurred, though that man lived eighteen hundred years ago ? His appearance, instead of being followed by the interposition of God to avenge Israel of its enemies, was on the contrary, followed by giving Israel into the hand of its enemies ; who, “ for the overspreading of abominations,” made Jerusalem a desolation, and delivered over its sinful population to the chains of slavery, and the bands of Death.

Elijah the Prophet is to “ turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers.” Did John the Baptist do this ? On the contrary, the morals of his countrymen, in his age, instead of growing from bad to better, went on from bad to worse, till there was no remedy, and the Sword of God did his work.

Indeed, and indeed Mr. Everett you are wrong ; and your superannuated allies, TYPE and FIGURE, whom I disdain to combat, cannot aid you to defend what is indefensible.

ments like him that treadeth in the winefat ?—I have trodden the wine press alone ; and of the peoples there was none with me : for I trode them in mine anger, and trampled them in my fury, and their blood sprinkled upon my garments, and I have stained all my raiment. For the *day of vengeance* is in mine heart, and the *year of my redeemed* is come. And I looked, and there was none to help : and I wondered there was none to uphold ; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me ; and my fury it upheld me, and I trode down the peoples in mine anger, and made them drunk in my fury, and I brought down their strength to the earth.” See Is. ch. lxiii. in the Hebrew. This passage relates to the “ Great and Terrible Day of Jehovah.” mentioned in Malachi. The Psalms of the Prophets abound with descriptions of it both terrible and magnificent. See for example Ezekiel xxxviii : & xxxix chapters. Joel ch. iii. and Zech. ch. xiv.



## PEBBLE V.

The Law of the Pentateuch, is pronounced by the Old Testament to be intended for a permanent and eternal Code for the Jewish nation. Mr. Everett denies this. Let us see nevertheless, if it cannot be proved.

The promulgation of the ordinance imposing circumcision on the descendants of Abraham, is in these words. "And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee ; Every man child among you shall be circumcised.—He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised ; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an *everlasting covenant*. And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people ; he hath broken my covenant." Gen. ch. xvii. 9.—14.

The ordinance of the Passover is also declared to be everlasting, "and this day [i. e. the feast of the Passover] shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast unto the Lord *throughout your generations* ; ye shall keep it a feast by *an ordinance for ever*." Ex. ch. xii. 14. see also v. 15.—in v. 17. it is said "ye shall observe this day in *your generations by an ordinance for ever*."

The ordinance of the day of atonement, is declared

to be a perpetual institution, "It shall be a statute for ever unto you." Lev. ch. xvi. 29. "It shall be a sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for ever." v. 31. "and this shall be an everlasting statute unto you." v. 34.

The feast of offering the first fruits of the year, is declared Lev. ch. xxiii. 14. "to be a statute for ever throughout your generations, in all your dwellings."

The feast of the Pentecost, is also declared in the same ch. of Lev. 21. to be a statute for ever, in all your dwellings throughout your generations." See also v. 41.

The ordinance of the Sabbath is pronounced a perpetual institution, "Verily my sabbath ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you, *throughout your generations*—Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath *throughout their generations for a perpetual covenant*: It is a sign between me and the children of Israel *for ever*." Ex. xxxi. 13—17.

As it is clearly evident from such passages as the above, that the law of Moses was *intended* to be a perpetual rule for the Israelites "throughout all their generations," as long as they should exist, Mr. Everett, in order to get rid of their force, has thought proper to annihilate the Jewish nation with a stroke of his pen. He maintains p. 350. of his work, that *no such nation exists* as the Jewish nation! This unexpected stroke was to me a confounding one—not on account of its force—but on account of its amazing effrontery.

The Jews not a nation! ask the histories of mankind; ask all writers who give an account of the different nations and peoples into which the race of Adam is divided! and Mr. Everett will find that they all consider the Jews as "a distinct and peculiar people." "But, says Mr. Everett, p. 350, if they are a nation, we can be told whereabouts they dwell,

and what cities they inhabit." Undoubtedly Mr. Everett can be told all this if he will take the trouble to ask their chiefs: and if he does he will be surprised to learn that the Jews, in cities and countries that can be named and pointed out, amount *probably* to ten millions of people, governed by their own law, so far as relates to their religion and intercourse with each other, and yet Mr. Everett maintains that the Jewish nation does not exist.\*

But I have a solemn answer from *immortal* lips to give to Mr. Everett's assertion, which he may possibly, if he be a religious man, hearken to, and tremble.

"Thus saith Jehovah, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and the stars for a light by night; which divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar; JEHOVAH OF HOSTS is his name: if those ordinances depart from before me saith Jehovah, then the seed of Israel shall cease *being* A NATION before me FOR EVER.

\* The enumerations given by the Jews themselves are always below the truth. They conceal the real amount for particular reasons. In Spain and Portugal, where it is dangerous for a man to be known to be a Jew, there are notwithstanding many thousands; probably one third of the population of Portugal is of Jewish descent. I have seen a Jew at Paris, who had resided several years in Spain, who has told me, that the number of his nation in Spain is great and unsuspected. I believe him, for Orobio and Acosta, both Jews of the Peninsula, affirm that Jews disguised as Christians, were to be found not only among the populace of the Peninsula, but among the nobles and bishops. In those countries (Spain and Portugal,) where the Inquisition obliged every body to be educated as Christians, the fathers who were secretly Jews, were accustomed, when their children came to the years of discretion, to inform them of their descent, and to engage them secretly to conform to the religion of their fathers. If they found their conversion impracticable, these wretched parents were accustomed to poison such children, to prevent their communicating the dangerous secret to the Inquisition, which would occasion the whole family to be burned alive. See the Biography of Orobio and Acosta for some interesting information upon this subject.



Thus saith Jehovah, if heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I also will cast off all the seed of Israel, for all that they have done saith Jehovah." Jer. ch. xxxi. 35, 36, 37.

But, says Mr. Everett, p. 352, "above all, the Jews have no national existence in respect of their religion; which is really the principal point to be urged. The tribe of Levi which was separated to the service of the temple, and the family of Aaron, exonerated to the priesthood, and ordained to be "a perpetual duration" have both been long extinct, at least have long since ceased to be traced."

This is incorrect. The tribe of Levi is not extinct, neither has the family of Aaron ceased to be traced. Hundreds, perhaps thousands of Jews at present existing, are recognized by their brethren as of the tribe of Levi, and the descendants of Aaron to this day have the privilege of blessing the people in the Synagogues on solemn days, in a peculiar form which no other Jews are allowed to employ.

This marvellous fact, that the descendants of David and Aaron should yet be discriminated amidst the general confusion of the tribes, is an illustrious verification of the following promise of Him whose word never fails, which I now oppose to the last rash assertion of his creature who has denied it.

"Thus saith Jehovah, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel, neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me\* to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat

\* "David shall never *want a man* to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel, neither shall the priests the Levites *want a man* before me," i. e. the house of David and the tribe of Levi shall never be extinct, when called upon to fulfil the prophecies of the kingdom of the Messiah, and the re-establishment of the ritual of the temple, David will not *want a man* to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel, neither will the priests the Levites *want a man* to do sacrifice. And how was this to be secured, *because* says God, "as

offerings, and to do sacrifice continually. Thus saith Jehovah : if ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season ; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the Levites the priests my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites the priests that minister unto me." "Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, the *two families which Jehovah hath chosen, he hath even cast them off?* Thus have they *despised my people* that they should be *no more A NATION* before them. Thus saith Jehovah, If my covenant be not with day and night, and I have appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth ; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not

the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites the priests that minister unto me." That this is the sense of the phrase "shall not want a man," is evident from the employment of the same expression by Jeremiah in xxxv. of his Prophecies : "Thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel : Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not *want a man to stand before me for ever*, ch. xxxv. 19. i. e. not that a particular descendant of Jonadab the son of Rechab should *always be standing* in the presence of the Lord for ever : but that he should never want a representative, his posterity should never be cut off. It is a singular fact that the descendants of Jonadab the son of Rechab still exist in Arabia, preserving the customs of their fathers ; they are called "Beni al Khaib," i. e. descendants of Heber. See Jud. ch. iv. 11.

To these considerations it may be added, that Jeremiah himself predicts the dethronement of the house of David, the destruction of the temple, and the captivity of the priests, and the whole Jewish nation, and as it is an allowed principle of sound criticism that if the expressions of a writer are capable of two significations, one of which would make him contradict himself, and the other would leave him consistent : it is but fair to suppose that he meant to be consistent, and should be interpreted in the sense which excludes self contradiction.



take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, FOR I WILL CAUSE THEIR CAPTIVITY TO RETURN AND HAVE MERCY UPON THEM." Jer. xxxiii. 17—26.

I presume that the CHRISTIAN CLERGYMAN who has contradicted his BIBLE and his GOD, is ready to exclaim like humbled Job ; " I have uttered what I understood not ; things too wonderful for me which I knew not ; wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." Job ch. xlii. See Appendix. H.

Shall I proceed to the consideration of some little arguments of Mr. Everett against the intended perpetuity of the Mosaic law derived from some expressions in the Psalms and the Prophets. ? Is it possible that Mr. Everett the scholar and the clergyman, is ignorant, that according to the idiom of the Hebrew language all such passages are merely expressive that God *lays no stress* upon sacrifice, and burnt offering, if unsanctified by righteousness and good works ? Mr. Everett has *blindly* recommended a passage to my *serious* attention, p. 358, which ought to have made him sensible of this.

" Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, put your burnt offerings to your sacrifices, and eat the flesh thereof. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day I brought them out of Egypt concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them saying, obey my voice." Jer. ch. vii. 23, 24. What ! might a critic of the cast of Mr. Everett exclaim, did not God indeed command the children of Israel, when he brought them out of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices ? are not the books of Leviticus and Numbers filled with regulations concerning them ? Very true, might a rational scholar reply to him, but this and several other expressions in the Psalms and Isaiah are Hebræisms, i. e. peculiar idioms of the language, expressing *comparison*



not *rejection* ; this passage in Jeremiah implying that when God brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, in giving his law to them he laid *no stress* upon burnt offerings and sacrifices, in comparison with moral duties.

Finally, I would ask Mr. Everett, whether he believes it was the intention of David, of Isaiah, and Jeremiah, to declare to the Jews of their times that God would *no more* accept of burnt offerings and sacrifices ! and that the ceremonial law was *ipso facto* abolished ; because, if such passages *do* signify the abolishment of the Mosaic law, it must be considered as having been a dead letter ever since David, Isaiah, and Jeremiah uttered these expressions.

But, says Mr. Everett, p. 357, “ the positive declaration of God, puts the matter [the repeal of the Mosaic law] beyond a doubt.”

“ Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to lead them out of the land of Egypt ; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord : but this shall be my covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God ; and they shall be my people.” Jer. xxxi. 31, &c.

I would observe first, that Mr. Everett in applying this passage to the purpose for which he has adduced it, has against him the opinions of all those Christian critics whom he allows to excel in critical learning ; viz. Michaelis, Ekerman, Lessing, Eichorn, &c. For this passage is quoted to the same purpose in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. viii. 8. and all the critics above mentioned main-

tain, as Mr. Everett allows, that none of the passages of the Old Testament quoted in the New, can be supported as prophecies of the things to which they are applied, but hold that they were quoted merely by way of accommodation or allusion.

2. I would observe, that this passage is one out of several more in the prophets, which represent that *after* the general restoration of Israel to their country, God will put a new spirit in them, and cause them to obey his voice ; (which was not done at the giving of the law, the Israelites being left to obey it or not ; after being given to understand what should be the rewards of obedience and the curses of disobedience,) this very chapter of Jeremiah, from which this quotation is taken, expressly representing, that this new covenant is to be made AFTER the Israelites are restored to their own land : which completely excludes the idea that this new covenant can relate to *a new religion*, fabricated seventeen hundred years ago ; and renders the solemnity with which Mr. Eeverett has introduced it, somewhat ridiculous.

This “ new covenant ” also, is not to put the old law out of remembrance, but is to “ write it on their hearts.” “ Behold, I will gather them out of all countries whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath ; and I will bring them again into this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely : and they shall be my people, and I will be their God : and I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them and their children after them. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, THAT I will not turn away from them, to do them good ; but I will put my fear into their hearts, that they shall not depart from me. Yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them

in this land with my whole heart and with my whole soul." Jer. xxxii. 37—41.\*

In order to manifest that the prophecy of the new covenant, quoted from Jeremiah by Mr Everett, had no reference to the promulgation of the new law, I had said in my first publication, "that though the prophet speaks of a "new covenant" he says nothing of a new law. On which Mr. Everett labours greatly to prove, See p. 357 &c. of his book, that the expression "making a new covenant," *must* signify making a new law, and cannot signify reimposition of the old.

There is a history in the Bible which convicts this opinion of mistake, which I propose in my turn to Mr. Everett's "*serious attention.*"

"These are the words of the *covenant*, which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children

\* Ezekiel gives a prophecy of the same events spoken of by Jeremiah, and in these words. "Thus saith Jehovah God; I will even gather you from the peoples, and assemble you out of the countries where ye have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel. And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh, that they may walk in *my statutes*, and keep *mine ordinances*, and do them; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God." Ez. ch. xi. 17, 18, 19, 20. Now what is meant in the Old Testament by "God's statutes, and God's ordinances," is not the Mosaic law *always* signified by these expressions? Again, Ezek. says, ch. xxxvi. 23, &c. "I will sanctify my great name, which was profaned among the nations, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the nations shall know that I am Jehovah, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes. For I will take you from among the nations, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land; then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I release you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and will give you a heart of flesh, and I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to *walk in my statutes*, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them." See also Ezekiel, ch. xxxvii. from verse 20 to the end.



of Israel in the land of Moab, *beside the covenant* which he made with them in Horeb. And Moses called unto all Israel, and said unto them ; ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God, your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel ; your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood to the drawer of thy water ; that thou shouldest *enter into covenant* with the Lord thy God," &c. Deut. ch. xxix.

And what was the covenant ? why, as the reader may find by perusing the rest of this piece of history in the Pentateuch, it was the *reimposition* of the Law of Moses upon the new generation of Israelites, who were children when their fathers came out of Egypt. So that Mr. Everett must see, that God's making a new covenant, *can be* accompanied with a reimposition of the law, since in the instance considered, he has actually done it once before.

I have, however, another passage in reserve, which must compel Mr. Everett to resign his unfounded opinions on this subject.

Moses, the giver of the law, after predicting most exactly what should befall the Jewish nation for disobedience to it, in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, proceeds in the 30th ch. to inform them, that the time would come, when " the Lord their God will turn their captivity and have compassion upon them, and will return and gather them from all the nations whither the Lord their God hath scattered them."

" If thy dispersion,\* (says the lawgiver) shall be unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee. And the Lord thy God will bring thee unto the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it ; and he will do thee good and

\* Ac. to the Hebrew.

multiply thee above thy fathers, and the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the Lord thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies, and on them that hate thee, and which persecuted thee. *And thou shalt return, and obey the voice of the Lord,* AND DO ALL HIS COMMANDMENTS WHICH I COMMAND THEE THIS DAY." Deut. ch. xxx.\*

In accordance with this express prediction of Moses, that when the Israelites should be gathered out of all countries into their own land, God would give them a heart and disposition to love the Lord their God, and to do all his commandments which *Moses was then delivering to them*, are the prophecies of Ezekiel: who in his last chapters, after giving a prophecy of the general return of the descendants of Jacob to their own land, proceeds to predict the division of the country, between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates, among the restored tribes, and minutely describes the plan, parts, offices, and ceremonies, of a new and eternal temple to be rais-

\* In my first publication I had maintained, that Jesus Christ had not taught the abolishment of the Law, and alleged in proof the passages following. "Think not I am come to destroy the law or the Prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, *Till heaven and earth pass*, one jot [i. e. the smallest letter of it] or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." (or consummated) Mat. v. 17. 18. "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke. xvi. 17. Mr. Everett has a device by which he thinks he can evade the gripe of these passages: perhaps the following may satisfy him that there is no way of escape. Luke reports, Acts xxi. 20. that James the bishop of the mother church of Jerusalem, said to Paul, "Thou seest brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe: [i. e. are Christians] and *they are all zealous of the Law.*" Now if Jesus Christ had taught the abolishment of the Law, it appears to me that his followers would not have been *zealous* in adhering to it: as to do so would be giving the lie to their master's doctrine.

ed upon the ancient site of that of Solomon, that is to be consecrated by the re-establishment of the magnificent ritual of Moses, with augmented splendour.

That the prophecy of Moses, and those of Ezekiel, referred to, have never yet been fulfilled, is undeniable; and that they will be fulfilled, will not be doubted by a Christian; and can hardly be disbelieved by a Sceptic, who will take the trouble to compare the history of "the eternal people,"\* with the predictions concerning it which have been fulfilled to the letter.

Mr. Everett, in the 449 page of his work, speaks rather contemptuously of the law of Moses. It is somewhat amusing to see a descendant of savage wanderers of the woods, who painted themselves blue in order to look handsome,† and whose posterity, and among them Mr. Everett himself, might so far as religion and morals is concerned, but for the instruction originally derived from the law of Moses, be still in the same respectable state, speaking lightly of a Book to which every nation on the Globe, who have any *rational* ideas of God or futurity, are absolutely indebted for that invaluable knowledge. The Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan religions, by which so many of our unfortunate race have been brought to a knowledge of God, and made candidates for an eternity of bliss, are all founded on, and derived from the Pentateuch. If that Book had never existed, those religions could not have existed. All

\* So called in Is. ch. lxvi. 22.

† The ancient Britons were savages and painted themselves blue when wishing to appear in full dress. In truth it is hardly three hundred years since the bears of Europe have learned to walk up on their hinder legs, and had "a man's heart given unto them." And it is only about two hundred years since "the wild boar out of the forest" has become a learned pig. It is not much more than a hundred years since the people of Boston, have left off hanging their fellow creatures for being witches and Quakers.



that part of mankind who have any claims to reason in their Religion, are therefore indebted to this Jew Book for the benefit.

Nor is this all the wonder. The sublime and fundamental Doctrine of the Pentateuch—One God—Eternal and Supreme—the Almighty Creator and and tremendous Avenger—can be traced up to Abraham, that wandering shepherd who at the command of God left his country and his father's house, to go to a foreign land, where he lived and died a stranger and a pilgrim.

What ideas should we entertain of a man whose tent was frequented by angels, and with whom the Supreme “conversed face to face, as a man talketh with his friend!” of a man who lived and died a shepherd, yet to whom it was predicted four thousand years ago, by Him whose word never fails, that “his name should be great, that it should be a blessing, and that in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed.” Sceptic! has not this prophecy been fulfilled? Is not the name of Abraham a theme of blessing to the Jew—the Christian—the Magian—and the Musselman? Is not his name pronounced with reverence throughout the four continents of the Globe? Has not the earth been blessed in his seed? Is there a nation or people upon it, who have any rational ideas of God or futurity, who have not derived them from Moses, Jesus, or Mohammed? Are we not indebted to these descendants of this wonderful man,\* for the consolations which support the soul under the trials of life, and for the faith and hope that smooth the bed of death? assuredly—assuredly. The events of past ages have verified the divine origin of the prediction, and ages to come will still farther confirm it.

Mr. Everett objects to the law of Moses, its mul-

\* Mohammed was descended from Abraham through Ishmael.

multiplied forms and ceremonies; but these were mostly not obligatory upon the whole nation, but upon one tribe set apart to this duty, and who had nothing else to do.\*

The influence of these rights and ceremonies—and no religion can perpetually exist without them, for after all the man is the slave of his senses, and powerfully affected by the impressions made upon them—cannot be doubted by one who attentively considers their amazing magnificence.

A temple blazing with the most precious productions of the mine,† and inaccessible to all but the consecrated descendants of one man, standing at the extremity of an immense area covered with variegated marble, and surrounded by magnificent corridors and porticos; a gorgeous host of nearly forty thousand priests,‡ to minister at the ever smoking altar, and to nourish the eternal fire; the golden ewer containing the hallowed blood of atonement, and the censer streaming clouds of fragrance, in the hands of the trembling descendant of Aaron ap-

\* The numerous regulations concerning defilement, and the ritual of purification, contained in the Pentateuch, were very proper in reference to the immediate and personal presence of the Divinity among the Israelites, which therefore rendered the most perfect cleanliness a duty. These regulations were also adopted to the peculiar circumstances of the Jewish nation, which was separated from all the rest of mankind and not obliged to go over their frontier to mingle with other people. But it is very true that such regulations are “not calculated for us” Gentiles; because men who are obliged constantly to mingle with other men, cannot observe them.

† According to 1 Chron. ch. xxix. 3, &c. the gold employed in adorning the temple, amounted to at least 8000 talents, and the silver to 17000 talents. This vast mass of treasure was given by David and his princes: how much was added to it by Solomon is not said.

‡ The number of the males of the tribe of Levi in the time of Moses, is said, Numbers, ch. xxvi. 62. to have been twenty three thousand. But in the reign of Solomon the number of males of the tribe of Levi from thirty years and upwards, was thirty-eight thousand. See 1 Chron. ch. xxiii. 3.



proaching the inner sanctuary of the INVISIBLE AND ALMIGHTY ; three hundred sons of song, accompanied with psaltery and cymbal, and "the harp with a solemn sound," resounding the attributes of HIM WHO IS, AND EVER SHALL BE ;\* and hundréds of thousands of worshippers prostrating their foreheads on the pavement in awe and extacy, as the temple shines forth with the Shechinah, streaming its rainbow glories into the heart of heaven, and covering the earth with its effulgence, plainly showing that GOD IS THERE ! This, all this Mr. Everett pronounces, "all calculated to occupy the attention of a simple and unfeeling people." p. 344.† There is,

\* The name of the Deity "JEHOVAH," is a compound of two Hebrew words, the first of which signifies "HE IS," and the second "HE SHALL BE." The word JEHOVAH expresses these two sublime ideas in three syllables.

† Mr. Everett represents me as supposing (because I maintain that it is the sense of the prophets that the temple of Jerusalem will one day be the house of prayer for all mankind) that all nations must come and worship at the temple *three times a year* as the Jews were required to do. See Mr. Everett's work, p. 207.

But if Mr. Everett were more familiar with the Bible, he would learn that the prophets represent that this visit to the future temple, from other nations than the Jews, will be required only *once* a year. "And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem, shall even go up from *year to year* to worship the King Jehovah of Hosts, and to keep the feast of Tabernacles." Zech. ch. xiv. 16.

Now *supposing* that the Old Testament predicts the truth in affirming that the earth is to be restored to its primitive state, as it was at the beginning, when God viewed every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good. If the earth is spontaneously to produce the delicious nourishment which we may suppose that Adam enjoyed, a journey once a year through an ever varied paradise to the temple of Jehovah, can surely be no toil. If a person will look at the situation of Jerusalem on a map of the world, he will be sensible, that no spot on earth is as eligible to be chosen for a common centre of worship for mankind as that city. It stands about sixty miles from the Mediterranean, which communicates with the Atlantic, and not many days journey from the Red Sea, which communicates with the Indian Ocean. And when the winds and waves shall cease to be dangerous, who would not desire to visit as often as possible, the land which is said to be "the glory of all lands," and illuminated by the ineffable symbol of the



not however, a philosopher on earth that would walk barefoot over its whole circumference to witness such a sight.

With this terminates my reply to Mr. Everett. I leave it to his consideration, whether he has fulfilled the magnificent promises held out to the public in the splendid table of contents prefixed to his book; from which it should seem as if I were actually crushed into the dust; and I leave it to the consideration of my abused and deluded countrymen, whether the heavy artillery of the law and the prophets, which I have wheeled out from the Old Testament, has not fairly blown the old board fences behind which a crazy superstition is ensconced, and which Mr. Everett has painted up to look like real fortifications, and mounted with quaker guns, to splinters and fragments.

immediate presence of the Lord of the Universe, at whose effulgence "the sun shall be ashamed, and the moon confounded."

Neither is it necessary to suppose, that I know of, that every man of the human race should be annually present; if some come from all nations, all nations may be said to come. See Appendix, I.

## THE SLING.

WHAT was the real history and character of Jesus Christ?

Mr. Everett had a right to consider my expressions, relative to this subject contained in my first work, as "far from being explicit;" for in fact I hardly knew what to think of the unparaelled son of Mary. That he was a pious and blameless man, I conceived that no man of good heart could doubt, while the supposition that he claimed to be the Messiah, I believed and still believe to be incompatible with such a character as his.

With the reader's permission, I will now state what I conceive may have been the real truth with regard to him.

I believe that Jesus of Nazareth was certainly a righteous man, and probably one who wished to bring back his countrymen to a rational observance of the law, and to abandon their traditions.

He appeared in an age when the *religious* part of the Jewish nation had made the law in many respects of none effect by those traditions, and had rendered their religion a stumbling block to the Gentiles, by reason of the puerile superstitions they had added to it: thus counteracting the express design, for which they had been set apart from other nations, (*viz.* to bring them to the knowledge and acknowledgement of the unity and supremacy of God;)

and violating the command of Moses, "ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." Deut. ch. iv.—and when the *irreligious* part of the nation, had become dreadfully corrupt.

The Jewish people at that time were oppressed and despised; the prophets of the Old Testament had taught them to believe that at a time when their oppressions should be at their height, their Messiah should appear. Of consequence the appearance of such a man as Jesus Christ, at that time when they considered themselves as crushed under the Roman yoke, possibly led them or some of them to believe that he might be their expected deliverer. But the Jewish nation at that time were unworthy of such a deliverance. They longed for their Messiah, not for righteousness, but for vengeance sake; not to hail him as the benefactor of the human race, but as the avenger of their wrongs upon all the world who had crushed and despised them.

Such a people were not the lawful candidates for the happiness of the eternal kingdom; and they afterwards learned, by the event of their struggle with the Romans, that they must not expect deliverance till they had become less unworthy of it.

Jesus, by preaching against the traditions of the elders, by not observing the Sabbath day so rigidly as the Pharisees, by denouncing them as hypocrites, tithers of mint anise and cummin, washers of plates and platters, and neglecters of the weightier matters of the law, justice, judgment, and mercy, as serpents, a generation of vipers, whited sepulchres, and what not, had enraged these superstitious fanatics to the last degree. But they could not wreak their vengeance, because he was protected by the



people whom the gospels represent as expecting with the most anxious impatience, that he would announce himself as their deliverer.\* But when repeated importunity, accompanied by an attempt to seize upon him and by compulsion oblige him to head them, terminated only in causing Jesus to escape and withdraw himself from their wishes† the people were disgusted, and abandoned him.

The Chief Priests and Pharisees took advantage of this abandonment, to seize him and deliver him to the Roman governor as a *dangerous man*, who either *was* willing to head the people against the Romans, or who might be made *the pretext* of an insurrection, as the people had shown a disposition to recognize him as the Messiah.‡ Such I believe to be as near an approximation to the true history of Jesus Christ, as can be made at this day.

Let us now review the points I have endeavoured to establish in this work.

\* “And Jesus walked in the temple in Solomon’s porch. Then came the Jews round about him, and said unto him, how long dost thou draw our souls asunder? If thou be the Messiah, tell us plainly.” John x, 23, 24. See the original Greek.

† “When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come, and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain, himself alone.” John vi. 15.

‡ It is remarkable that the gospels represent Jesus as refusing to acknowledge himself to *the Jews* as the Messiah. The gospels say, that Jesus confided his Messiahship to the disciples as a *secret*, with express injunctions not to betray it. “Then charged he his disciples *that they should tell no man that he was the Messiah.*” Mat. xvi. 20. See also Mark viii. 29. and Luke ix. 21. This makes it possible that he *never did claim that character*, and that the glory in the gospels that he had *told it as a secret* to his disciples, was *invented* in order to furnish a reply to the Jews, who might have told the first Christians, that Jesus had never told them so, and of course never pretended to be considered as such, and that the Christians could not justly blame them for rejecting pretensions which Jesus never made to them, to whom especially he ought to have plainly declared them if he wished them to be received. The truth of the matter appears to be, that the notion of the Messiahship of Jesus, had originally no better foundation than the mistaken enthusiasm of his followers.

1. I have endeavoured to show that the miracles, supposed by Mr. Everett to have been wrought by Jesus in proof of his Messiahship, *cannot be proved*; because that the New Testament is not to be depended on as competent testimony for the real history and real doctrines of Jesus of Nazareth; and therefore, that the question of his Messiahship must in all events be decided by an appeal to the Old Testament.

2. It has been shown, that the prophecies of the Messiah contained in the Old Testament, have not been fulfilled in Jesus; and that those prophecies which Mr. Everett regards as proofs of the Christian religion, were also not fulfilled in Jesus.

3. It has been shown, that the law of Moses was *intended* for a perpetual law for the Jewish nation, "through all their generations forever;" and of course that it is, and must be perpetually obligatory upon them; and consequently whether JESUS BE THE MESSIAH, OR NOT, the Jews are bound to adhere to the law of Moses.\*

\* The case of the Jews and Christians is parallel to that of "the prophet of Judah," and "the prophet of Bethel." The Christians allow that *God himself* gave the law to the Jews, but they say to the Jews that Jesus was ordered by God to repeal it.

"It was said unto me (says the prophet of Judah) by the word of Jehovah, Thou shalt eat no bread, nor drink water there, (at Bethel the chapel of the golden calf,) nor turn to go by the way that thou camest. He (i. e. the prophet of Bethel) said unto him, I am a prophet also as thou art; and *an angel spake unto me* by the word of Jehovah, saying, Bring him back with thee into thine house, that he may eat bread and drink water. *But he lied unto him.* So he went back with him, and did eat bread in his house, and drink water."

"And it came to pass, as they sat at the table, that the word of Jehovah came unto the prophet that brought him back: and he cried unto the man of God that came from Judah, saying, Thus saith Jehovah, forasmuch as thou hast disobeyed the mouth of Jehovah, and hast not kept the commandment which Jehovah thy God commanded thee, but camest back, and hast eaten bread and drunk water in the place, of the which Jehovah did say unto thee, eat no bread, and drink no water, thy carcase shall not come unto the sepulchre of thy fathers." 1 Kings, ch. xiii.



4. It has been shown, that it is absolutely impossible to know the real history of Jesus with certainty; the Jews and Christians ought for the future to consider his character, not as a subject of dispute, nor an occasion of quarrel, much less as a cause of mutual aversion, but merely as a matter of speculation.

Should these positions ever be recognised by the Jews and Christians as reasonable and true, let us consider what may be the consequence.

1. The Christians become sensible, that the New Testament is not to be depended on, would cease to hate, to persecute, and to annoy the unfortunate Jews, on account of their rejecting its doctrines.

2. The Christians would themselves adhere to the Old Testament, as the rock and rule of faith and morals; and would worship with the Jews the One Jehovah without equal or companion, and obey the *moral law* of the Old Testament; leaving the observance of its *ceremonial* institutions to the nation for whom they were intended:\* like the "devout Gentiles" in the time of Josephus and Christ.

\* 1. If the Christians should do this, the fundamental articles of their creed would be, to love the Lord their God with all their heart, and with all their mind, and soul, and strength, and to love their neighbours as themselves: for on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

2. If the Christians should do this, they would have precisely the same Scriptures which the apostles and first Christians had, and which they considered as sufficient. Even Paul himself pronounces, that the Old Testament was "given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be *perfect, thoroughly furnished* unto all good works." 2 Tim. ch. iii. 16.

3. If the Christians should do this, all the endless and rancorous disputes about the trinity, incarnation, atonement, transubstantiation, worship of the Virgin Mary, the saints, their images and relics, the supremacy of the Pope, et id genus omne, would be quietly laid upon the shelf, and torment mankind no more.

4. The hundred sects into which Christians are divided would coalesce; for it is the New Testament which keeps them asunder.



3. The Jews, seeing the Christians Unitarians as well as themselves, would cease to regard the Christians as impious idolators, and cruel enemies.

4. Both parties would worship and serve God as brethren, and children of the same father ; and await in faith and hope the appearance of the GREAT PERSONAGE, who is to make them and all the good part of mankind, perfectly happy.

Should what I have written have any tendency to promote union and friendly feelings between the parties to a dispute which has for nearly eighteen hundred years occasioned such cruel oppressions and bloody persecutions to the side which is in the right, I shall not have lived in vain ; and though the cause in which I have exerted myself has occasioned me much detriment and distress,\* and may possibly ultimately oblige me to die in a

So long as that book is believed to contain a Revelation from God, there can be no peace. For pious and good men who believe that it *is* of divine authority, and who are zealously disposed to discover from its contents "what *is* the mind of the spirit," must *necessarily* be divided in their opinions ; BECAUSE the New Testament is not only inconsistent with the Old, but is also inconsistent with itself too ; and must therefore necessarily create a diversity of opinions in those who reverence it as the word of God. This is the grand secret, and everacting cause, which has made scisms in the church.

\* Mr. Everett, p. 427 of his work, alluding to my anticipations in one of my publications, in which I expressed myself as aware of what I should have to encounter, in consequence of my undertaking in behalf of the oppressed and slandered Jews ; says with something like "the charity of a monk, and the meekness of an inquisitor," that "the affecting allusion he (Mr. English,) has made to his prospects in the world, has many a time restrained me, when I ought to have used the language of indignation."

If a man had told me, that in consequence of my enterprise I should encounter great misfortunes, I should have answered, I expected, and was prepared to meet them. But if he had told me, a native of the New World discovered a few centuries ago, that the time would come when I should write upon this subject, in the very land, and almost on the very spot that gave birth to Moses and the Pharoahs, I should have thought him amusing himself with a jest : nevertheless such is the fact. I write this book on the banks of old Nile, and in sight of the pyramids.

foreign land, without a friend to close my eyes ; I comfort my heart with the hope, that I may have done somewhat for the great cause of truth, justice, and humanity, and for the promotion of mutual regard and friendly feelings, among a very large portion of the human race.

## APPENDIX.

### A

For instance, it is said in the 2d. ch. of the Gospel called of Mathew, that Jesus, when brought out of Egypt by his parents, “came and dwelt in the city called Nazereth : that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet. “He shall be called a Nazerene.”

Now there is no such passage as this throughout the Old Testament : the author of the Gospel called of Mathew must therefore, it seems to me, have forged this supposed prophecy out of his own head, or must have mistaken the sense of some passage in the Old Testament : if he was capable of either, he was not the honest and inspired Mathew, the Apostle of Jesus Christ. There is a passage in the Old Testament, which might have led a Gentile, ignorant of the Jewish Scriptures into this mistake, but could not have misled a Jew. In the history of Sampson Judges xiii. 5. it is said, “that he should be a *Nazarete* unto God from the womb.” But a Nazerite was one thing and a *Nazarene* another : the first was a man who had a peculiar vow upon him, described Numbers. 7. ch., but a *Nazarene* was a man belonging the city of Nazereth in Palestine. The quotation is a proof with me, that the author of the Gospel as-



cribed to Matthew was a Gentile, of course not Matthew who was a Jew, and incapable of making such a blunder.\*

Again, in the Gospel called of Matthew ch. xxvii. 9. a passage is quoted as a prophetic proof text from *Jeremiah*, says the author. "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet saying, and they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; and gave them for the Potters field, as the Lord appointed me." There is no such passage as this in "Jeremy the prophet," nor in any of the Books of the Old Testament. But Jerom asserts, that it was taken from an Apocryphal Book ascribed to Jeremiah: he says that he saw the apocryphal book from whence this is taken. See Jerom's Commentary upon Matthew tom. iv. p. 1. p. 134. See also Marsh's *Michaelis* Vol. I. p. 490. as quoted by Mr. Everett.

It appears to me, that an honest man would not quote, as prophetic authority, a forged book ascribed to Jeremiah: and an inspired man as the Christians suppose Matthew to have been, still less.

In short the quotations in the New testament from the Old, adduced as prophecies of Jesus and the Religion of the New Testament, are so very inapplicable to that purpose, that the most celebrated of the Christian Theologians of the present day, have found themselves obliged to abandon all attempts to sup-

\* I have read in a Magazine, of an itinerant Methodist preacher, not perfectly acquainted with the sublime arts of reading and writing, who, in a sermon of his in praise of Industry, alledged as a proof of God's aversion to idleness, that God commanded Moses, when he built the Tabernacle in the wilderness, to cover it with "BEGGAR'S SKINS." The English Translation says Ex. ch. xxvi. 14. with BADGER'S SKINS." Now I suppose that if such a quotation from the Old Testament, was found in a work whose title page represented it to have been written by Bishop Marsh, that there is not a scholar in Christendom, who would not pronounce the book to be a forgery.

port them as prophecies fulfilled in the events to which they are applied. They maintain, as will appear hereafter in the course of this work, that *not one* of the passages, quoted in the New Testament from the Old, was quoted as a prophecy, but merely by way of accommodation or allusion. If so, it may be replied, that it is very extraordinary, that the authors of the books of the New Testament who are almost continually representing that Jesus *was* predicted by the prophets, should after all never have adduced *one* of those predictions, although they are perpetually quoting the Old Testament. But the truth of the matter probably is, that the writers of the New Testament, did firmly believe that the passages they have quoted, were really predictions of the events and doctrines to which they refer them. This is clear from the Epistle to the Hebrews for instance, it is a deliberate and formal defence of the Doctrines of Christianity, addressed to the Jews, or Jewish Christians, in which the author attempts to show from the Old Testament, allowed by the Jews as oracular, that the Pre-existence, Divinity, Priesthood, and Atonement of Jesus Christ, as supposed by the Christians, were predicted in the Old Testament, and proved by his citations.\*

\* Mr. Everett says p. 243, of his work that "*not one of the Books of the New Testament, nor all of them together, were intended to be a forensic defence of Christianity.*" The Epistle to the Hebrews, at least, convicts this opinion of mistake.

He says also p. 273., "As to what Mr. English, after Collins, proceeds to say, that the authors of the books of the New Testament always argue absolutely from the quotations they cite as prophecies out of the books of the old Testament, it is so far from being correct, that it is *highly notorious*, that *they do not argue from them at all.*" Mr. Everett must have felt very desperate to venture upon such an assertion in the face of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Mr. Everett may succeed with some in facing down *argument*, but he is mistaken if he thinks, that

"*Stubborn facts* must still give place

"To his impenetrable face,

"Which makes its way through all affairs, &c. &c."



Who is so blind as not to see, that this system of Defence is merely one of the last resort, adopted in circumstances of distress for want of a better?

Sure I am, that the believing part of the Christian Laity will never adopt this System, (though the unbelieving part probably gladly will) but would be extremely shocked on being told by their Clergy, that the passages quoted from the Old Testament by the writers of the New, which they and their predecessors from the 2nd century downwards have been accustomed to regard as veritable predictions of Jesus, and introduced too by such solemn prefaces as the following, "*all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying*" &c, or, "*in this was fulfilled that which was spoken by the prophet saying*" &c—were not after all adduced as prophecies, but *merely by way of allusion!*\*

## B

PASSAGES FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT REFERRING TO THE MESSIAH AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF HIS KINGDOM.

"Shiloh shall come, and to him shall the obedience of the peoples be." Ac. to the Hebr. Gen. xlix. 10.

"The adversaries of Jehovah shall be broken in pieces; out of Heaven shall He thunder upon them; Jehovah shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength unto his king, and exalt the horn of his Messiah." 1 Sam. ch. ii. 10.

"These be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was exalted on

\* Bishop Marsh does honour to his English honesty and common sense, in refusing to allow that such strong expressions can signify a mere accommodation of a passage in the Old Testament. See his Notes to Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament.



high, the Messiah of the God of Jacob, [See the Hebr.] and the sweet Psalmist of Israel. The Spirit of Jehovah spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me. He that ruleth over mankind [or the human race, See the Hebr.] shall be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning when the sun ariseth, even a morning without clouds ; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.—But the sons of Belial shall be all of them as thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with hands : but the man that shall touch them *must be fenced with iron, and the staff of a spear ; and they shall be utterly burned with fire in the same place.*” 2. Sam. ch. xxiii. 1.—7.

“ I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion, I will declare the decree, Jehovah hath said unto me. Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee ; ask of me, and I shall give thee the nations for thy inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron : thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” Ps. 2. See also Ps. 21.

“ He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with judgment. The mountains shall bring peace to the people, and the little hills by righteousness. He shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and shall *break in pieces the oppressor*. They shall fear thee *as long as the sun and moon endure throughout all generations*. He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass : as showers that water the earth. [compare 2. Sam. ch. xxi. 3. 4.] In his days shall the righteous flourish ; and abundance of peace *as long as the moon endureth*. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. [“ his dominions shall be from sea even to sea, and

from the river even unto the ends of the earth.” Zech. ix : 10.] they that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him ; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles [i. e. of Europe and the west,] shall bring presents ; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. *All kings shall fall down before him : all nations shall serve him.* For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth ; the poor also, and him that hath no helper. He shall spare the poor and needy, and shall save the souls of the needy. He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence : and precious shall their blood be in his sight. And *he shall live*, and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba ; prayer also shall be made for him continually ; and daily shall he be praised—His name shall endure for ever : his name shall be continued *as long as the sun* : and men shall be blessed in him : all nations shall call him blessed. Blessed be Jehovah God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever ; and let the whole earth be filled with his glory. Amen, and Amen.\* Ps. 72.

“Thou speakest in vision of thy holy [or pious] one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty : I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant ; with my holy oil have I anointed him : with whom my hand shall be established : mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him : nor the sin of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him : and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me thou art my father, my

\* This Psalm is entitled in the English version “a prayer for Solomon.” It should have been translated “a Psalm of Solomon.”



God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. ["although my house be not so with God : yet he hath made *with me* an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure." 2. Sam. ch. xxiii. 5.] His seed also will I make to endure forever, *and his throne as the days of heaven*.—My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and HIS THRONE AS THE SUN BEFORE ME. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in the heaven." Ps. 89.

"Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool. Jehovah shall send the rod of thy power out of Zion : rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.—Jehovah at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the nations ; he shall fill the places with the dead bodies : he shall wound the heads over many countries." Ps. 110.

"It shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established in the tops of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills ; and all the nations shall flow unto it. And many peoples shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob ; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths : for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many peoples : and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks : nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Is. ch. ii.

"Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given ;



and the Principality shall be upon his shoulder ; and the Wonderful Counsellor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father shall call his name the Prince of Peace.\* [See. the Heb.] Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of Jehovah of Hosts will perform this." Is. ix : 6, 7.

"There shall come forth a rod out of the stem (or stump, i. e. the roots of a tree cut down) of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots, and the spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Jehovah, and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of Jehovah : and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears : but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth ; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips *shall he slay the wicked*. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid : and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together ; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed : their young ones shall lie down together ; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.† And the sucking child shall play on

\* Mr Everett says p. 51. that "the Septuagint discountenances this rendering." What is that to me? I chose to abide by the original Hebrew, and not to follow a blundering, garbled, and interpolated version, which frequently imposes a false sense upon the original, and not unfrequently no sense at all. *more Christiano*.

† Mr. Everett, p. 52. considers this expression as a decisive proof that the prophecies of the Messiah's kingdom, must be understood figuratively. Is Mr. Everett so ignorant of his Bible as

the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrices den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain : for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea. And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the peoples ; to it shall the Gentiles seek ; and his seat shall be glory." [See the Hebr.] Is. ch. xi. " And it shall come to pass in that day, that Jehovah shall set his hand again *the second time* to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth." Is. ch. xi.

" And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all the peoples, (i. e. their ignorance of God's dispensations) and the vail that is spread over all the nations. He will swallow up death in victory ; (or to eternity) and Jehovah God will wipe away tears from off all faces : and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth : for Jehovah hath spoken it, and it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God ; we have waited for him, and he will save us ; thus saith Jehovah ; we have waited for him, we will be glad, and rejoice in his salvation." Is. xxv. 7—9.

" The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them ; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly and rejoice even with joy and singing : the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency

not to know, that it represents that at the beginning animals did not prey upon each other, and if it was so once, which Mr. Everett will not deny, it may be so again. See Gen. ch. i. 30.

of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of Jehovah, and the excellency of our God. Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees. Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not; behold your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense, he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert. And the parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons where each lay, shall be grass, with reeds and rushes. And the ransomed of Jehovah shall return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Is. xxxv.

"Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of Jehovah's hand, double for all her sins. The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Jehovah, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain. And the glory of Jehovah shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it. The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the spirit of Jehovah bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth; BUT THE WORD OF OUR GOD SHALL STAND FOR EVER." Is. xl.



“My people shall know my name : therefore shall they know in that day, that I am He that doth speak ; behold it is I. How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace ; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation ; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth ! Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing ; for they shall see eye to eye, when Jehovah shall bring again Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem ; for Jehovah hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem, Jehovah hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all nations ; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.” Is. lii.

### G. G.

The good Christians of the United States, I do not use the term in sarcasm, for they *are* good, speak in their books and sermons of the Christian religion as if it were every where the same as in the grand, free, and liberal republic. But the fact is not so. An American who reads the poems of Homer, or Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, laughs at the religion of the ancient Greeks and Romans as a ridiculous folly ; but when he visits those countries in Christendom which are not Protestant, he will be inclined to regard *their* religion as a blasphemy against the Most High. Go where you will in those countries, if you look into their churches, you invariably find “a molten image, or picture, and a teacher of lies.”\*

\* The Greeks, Russians, and Copts will not worship images, for that they say is flagrant idolatry ; but they say there is no harm in praying before a picture. Their churches and houses are full of them. I have heard of a Greek bishop who employed a famous Italian painter to make a picture of the bishop's patron, Isaiah : when it was finished he refused to take it, and expressed himself much shocked by its appearance. The painter asked why?

The prophets of the Old Testament reproached the idolatrous Jews, that “according to the number of their cities were their gods.” But in the countries I speak of, the number of gods is according to the number of churches, and even houses; for every house contains an image or picture of some saint or other, who is considered as the tutelary guardian of the family.

## H

Mr. Everett observes upon this prophecy of Jeremiah p. 75. of his work, “as it is near two thousand years since David has failed of a *temporal* prince upon his throne, and a *temporal* successor of Levites, and since it is declared that it shall NEVER fail of these, we must suppose that a *spiritual* succession and a *spiritual* service were intended: or else the solemn promise of God has been for two thousand years, without fulfillment.”

“Ut semper!”——

“Sternhold and Hopkins had great qualms,  
 “When they did quaver David’s Psalms;  
 “Which made their hearts full glad.  
 “But had the prophets back been sent,  
 “To hear *them* SING,—and *you* COMMENT,  
 “They surely had run mad.”

## I

PASSAGES FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT PREDICTING THE RESTORATION OF THE DISPERSION.

“Behold the former things are come to pass, and new things do I DECLARE: BEFORE THEY SPRING FORTH I TELL you them.”

“I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather

“your picture, said the bishop is scandalous, the figure stands out from the canvass absolutely as if it were a statue; it would be idolatry in me to pray before such a picture.”

thee from the west : I will say to the north, give up ; and to the south keep not back : bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth. Every one that is called by my name : for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him : yea I have made him. Is. xliii : 5, 6, 7.

“ Thus saith the Lord God, behold I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the peoples : and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers : they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and shall lick up the dust of thy feet : and thou shalt know that I am Jehovah, for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me. Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captive delivered. But thus saith Jehovah. Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken away, and the prey of the terrible shall be delivered : for I will contend with him that contendeth with thee ; and I will save thy children. And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh : and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine : and all flesh shall know that I Jehovah am thy Saviour, and thy Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob.” Is. xlix.

“ Jehovah shall comfort Zion, he will comfort all her waste places : and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desart like the garden of Jehovah ; joy and gladness shall be found therein ; thanksgiving and the voice of melody. Harken unto me my people, and give ear unto me O, my nation : for a law shall proceed from me, and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the peoples. My righteousness is near, my salvation is gone forth, and mine arms shall judge the peoples : the isles shall wait upon me, and on mine arm shall they lean.” [See the Heb.] Is. li.



“ Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed ; neither be thou confounded : for thou shalt not be put to shame : for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, [i. e. thy ancient idolatry] and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhoods [i. e. thy two dispersions] any more. For thy Maker is thy Husband, Jehovah of hosts is his name, and thy Redeemer the Holy one of Israel ; the God of the whole earth shall he be called. For Jehovah hath called thee as a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth, when thou hadst been refused saith thy God. For a small moment have I forsaken thee ; but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy upon thee, saith Jehovah thy Redeemer. For this is as the waters of Noah unto me : for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth ; so have I sworn that I will not be wroth with thee, nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed : but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith Jehovah that hath mercy on thee. O thou afflicted, tossed with tempest, and not comforted : behold I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones, and thy children shall be taught of Jehovah, and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established : thou shalt be far from oppression : for thou shalt not fear, and from terror, for it shall not come near thee.” Is. liv.

“ Behold thou shalt call a nation that thou knowest not, and nations that knew not thee shall run unto thee, because of Jehovah thy God : and for the Holy one of Israel : for he hath glorified thee,” Is. lv. 5.

“ Behold the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the peoples ; but Jehovah shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee. And the Gentiles shall come to thy light and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes round about and see : all they gather themselves together ; they come to thee : thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then thou shalt see and flow together, and thine heart shall fear and be enlarged ; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces [or wealth] of the Gentiles shall come unto thee. The multitude of camels shall cover thee ; the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah : all they from Sheba shall come : they shall bring gold and incense : and they shall show forth the praises of Jehovah. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth [i. e. the chiefs of the Arabs Nebaioth was the eldest son of Ishmael] shall minister unto thee : they shall come up with acceptance to mine altar, [doubtless, because they have been worshippers of one sole God of Abraham and the prophets since the days of Mohammed] and I will beautify the house of my glory. Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows ? Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver, and their gold with them : unto the name of Jehovah thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel because He hath glorified thee. And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee, for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favour have I had mercy on thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually ; they shall not be shut day nor night : that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish ; yea

L

those nations shall be utterly wasted. The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box-tree together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary : and I will make the place of my feet glorious. The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee : and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet ; and they shall call thee the city of Jehovah, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel. Whereas thou hast been forsaken, and hated, that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of endless [ac. to the Heb.] generations. Thou shalt suck the milk of the Gentiles, and shalt suck the breast of kings : and thou shalt know that I Jehovah am thy Saviour and thy Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob. For brass I will bring gold, and for iron I will bring silver ; and for wood brass, and for stones iron : I will also make thy officers peace, and thine exactors righteousness. Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders : but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise. The sun shall be no more thy light by day : neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee : but Jehovah shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy Glory. Thy sun shall no more go down ; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself ; for Jehovah shall be thy everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended. Thy people also shall be all righteous : they shall inherit the land forever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." Is ch. lx.

"Thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of Jehovah, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God. Thou shalt be no more termed forsaken : neither shall thy land any more be termed desolate—For as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons



marry thee : and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride so shall thy God rejoice over thee." Is. ch. lxii.

" Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with her all ye that love her : rejoice for joy with her all ye that mourn for her : that ye may suck, and be satisfied with the breasts of her consolations : that ye may milk and be delighted with the abundance of her glory. For thus saith Jehovah. Behold I will extend Peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like an overflowing stream : then shall ye suck, ye shall be borne upon her sides, and be dandled upon her knees. As one whom his mother comforted so will I comfort you ; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem." Is. lxvi.

" Thus saith Jehovah, keep ye judgment, and do justice : for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold of it, that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger who hath joined himself unto Jehovah, speak, saying, Jehovah hath utterly separated me from his people—the sons of the stranger that join themselves to Jehovah, to serve him, and to love the name of Jehovah, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant : even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer : their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on mine altar ; for mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples. Jehovah God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, yet will I gather others to him beside those that are gathered to him." Is. ch. lvi.

" Tell ye and bring them near ; yea, let them take counsel together : who hath *declared this* from an-

cient time? who hath told it from that time? Have not I Jehovah? and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour, there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the Earth: for I am God and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall one say, in Jehovah have I righteousness and strength: even to Him shall men come: and all that are incensed against Him shall be ashamed. In Jehovah shall all the seed of Israel be *justified*, and shall glory.\* Is. xlv. 21. &c.

\* "In the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it: and it shall bring forth boughs and bear fruit, and be a glorious cedar: and under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing; in the shadow of the branches thereof shall they dwell. And all the trees of the field shall know, that I Jehovah have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and made the dry tree to flourish, I Jehovah have spoken it and I will do it." Ezech. xvii. 23.

## ERRATA.

---

(The manuscript of this book was written in little more than three weeks at Cairo, amidst the hurry and bustle of my preparations to accompany Ismael Pasha to the Upper Nile. It has been printed without my having had it in my power to correct any of the proofs. In consequence of one or both of these circumstances the following *Errata* almost entirely literal have been committed. I believe however that the Scholar will not find any misstatement of facts, nor the Logician any flaw in the arguments; the book lays before the Public. On these two points I feel quite secure in this respect: and I calmly and firmly lay my gage at the feet of all Christendom. Let him who dares to take it up, do it.)

In the 2d. quotation in the title page for "choseth," read  
*chusest.*

Preface p. 6. l. 9. for "possessions," read *prepossessions.*

In p. 8. l. 5. for "these," read *their.*

p. 13. l. last in the note, for "mulata," read *mulato.*

p. 15. l. 8. for 26. read 36. l. 11. for 54. read 34.

p. 18. l. 12. from the bottom in the note for "these,"  
*the three.*

p. 36. l. 7. from the bottom after "was," insert *ac-*  
*cording to Mr. Everett.*

p. 41. l. 27. for Acts "4. 45." read Acts 4: 25.

p. 46. l. 12. for "come," read *came.*

p. 48. l. 13. for "exists," read *exist.*

p. 49. in the note for "Zerah," read *T'erah.*

p. 50. in the note line 17. from the bottom for "col-  
lected," read *collated.*

p. 53. l. 10. for "Romans," read *Asmoneans.* Do. in  
the note for "Tabnai," read *T'atnai.*

p. 55. for "carinficina," read *carnificina.*

p. 56. l. 2. from the bottom for "esteemed not," read  
*and we esteemed him not.*

p. 57. l. 5. for "with," read *through.*



## ERRATA.

- In p. 63. l. 27. for "will," read *well*.
- p. 65. l. 3. from the bottom in the note before "and,"  
insert *Grammar*.
- p. 66. l. 16. for "violations," read *quotations*.
- p. 74. l. 6. from the bottom for "sun," read *been*.
- p. 75. l. 4. for "simple," read *single*,
- p. 77. l. last dele "Joshua."
- p. 79. l. 8. read "heels over head."
- p. 83. l. 13. in the note for "of," read *and*.
- p. 87. l. 11. for "exonerated," read *consecrated*.
- p. 92. l. 5. for "the," read *a*.
- p. 95. in the notes line 7. after "forest," insert *of the North*.
- p. 97. l. 5. for "rights," read *rites*.
- do. l. 7. dele "the."
- do. l. 2. from the bottom for "streaming," read  
*steaming*.
- p. 98. l. 13. for "unfeeling," read *unreflecting*.
- p. 99. l. 1. after "would," insert *not*.
- p. 102. l. 15. in the notes for "glory," read *story*.
- p. 104. l. 1. after "that," insert *as*.
- p. 111. l. 3. for "was," read *is*.
- do. l. 5. from the bottom for ch. 21. read ch. 23.
- p. 115. l. 7. from the bottom for "thus saith," read  
*this is*.
- p. 117. l. 5. in the note for "patron Isaiah," read  
*patron Saint*.



JAN 1 1941











LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 159 911 0

